

Continues *The Sermonizer, Student and Teacher, Preacher's Assistant, Preacher's Magazine, and Preacher's Illustrator.*

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

ESTABLISHED IN 1889

Frank J. Boyer, Managing Editor and Publisher.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS—David James Burrell, D.D.,LL.D. William H. Bates, D.D.
Leander S. Keyser, D.D. David S. Kennedy, D.D.

Contributing Editors—W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Dyson Hague, D.D., William Phillips Hall,
Walter Duncan Buchanan, D.D.,LL.D., L. Franklin Gruber, D.D.,LL.D., A. William Lewis, D.D.,
H. W. Bromley, D.D., W. E. Biederwolf, D.D., John Roach Stratton, D.D., W. B. Riley, D.D.,
Harold Paul Sloan, D.D., William M. McPheeters, D.D., Charles Calvert Ellis, B.D.,Ph.D.,
J. L. Dickens, D.D.,LL.D., Bishop William F. Heil, D.D., Percy George Cross, D.D.

VALUE OF THE BIBLE

 F YOU destroy my confidence in the Bible, where am I? I know I go hence ere long, but what then? I take my place by the side of Socrates. Surely if there was ever a man who never knew the revealed Word of God, whose ideas are worthy of my respect, it is Socrates. I ask him about the future life, and in reply I hear him say: "I am to die, you are to live; but for which of us is the better none can tell. I think the lives of good men continue beyond; but of this wise men are not confident." And that is the very best that the wisdom of the world can do for me. Destroy my confidence in the Bible, and the future which I must face is all darkness. I know well the burden of self-condemnation which I carry. I know where I shall stand if I am judged according to justice. I need nobody to tell me that. But when I am induced to give up the Bible, I know no more. I need a deliverance, but there is no deliverer. I need help, but there is no helper. I have been persuaded to give up the Bible, and I find nothing to take its place. The brightness and the blessedness of human life are gone, and the sun of human hopes has entered into total, disastrous, and perpetual eclipse.—S. H. Wiley, D.D.

FRANK J. BOYER, PUBLISHER, READING, PA.

Price \$2.00 the Year Canada \$2.25, Foreign \$2.35 Single Copy 20 Cents

Entered as Second-class matter, at the Post Office, Reading, Pa., under act of March 3, 1897.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

CONTENTS—MAY, 1924

EDITORIAL

Evolution— <i>David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D.</i>	241
Theorizing in a Homiletic Magazine— <i>L. S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	245
Whence came the Bible— <i>D. S. Kennedy, D.D.</i>	246
A Sermon by Henry VanDyke— <i>L. S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	247
Christ Introductions— <i>Wm. H. Bates, D.D.</i>	249
The Blood! The Blood!— <i>Wm. H. Bates, D.D.</i>	250
Is it a Good Book?— <i>L. S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	252
The Present State of the Church— <i>D. S. Kennedy, D.D.</i>	254
Dr. Bates' Papers on the Books of the Bible	255
Freedom from Dogma	255
Hares Chewing the Cud— <i>Wm. H. Bates, D.D.</i>	256
Appropriative	258
Potter in Favor with Infidels— <i>L. S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	259
Walter Duncan Buchanan, D.D., LL.D.	260
Notes and Comments	259

THE ARENA

Osborn on "Evolution and Religion"— <i>L. S. Keyser, D.D.</i>	266
Professor Thompson's Articles— <i>Dyson Hague, D.D.</i>	270
The Evolutionist at the Bar— <i>Rev. Edwin Irving Niles</i>	274
The World— <i>Wm. H. Bates, D.D.</i>	277
The New Geology— <i>Joseph D. Wilson, D.D.</i>	278
Religion in Reach— <i>Lawrence Keister, D.D.</i>	280
Liberalism and Piety— <i>Rev. John A. Hoffman</i>	281
Keeping the Faith— <i>Christopher G. Hazard, D.D.</i>	283
Motherhood and Manhood— <i>Edwin Whittier Caswell, D.D.</i>	284
Cannot be Answered— <i>J. M. Stanfield</i>	285

THE SANCTUARY

God the Soul's Portion— <i>Wm. H. Bates, D.D.</i>	286
The Shepherd and His Sheep	291
God's Mercy	291
Emblems of the Holy Spirit	291

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE—*A. William Lewis, D.D.*

LIBRARY TABLE—*L. S. Keyser, D.D.*

Important Instructions: All mail should be addressed to, and all Money Orders and Drafts should be made payable to, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

Change in Address—It is very important that Old as well as New address be given. Always allow at least 10 days to make a change.

Expiration and Renewals—Your subscription expires with the month and year printed on your Address Label. When renewing please state that your remittance is for a renewal. We receipt new subscriptions by starting the magazine, and renewal subscriptions by changing your address label. A subscription blank enclosed in your magazine indicates your subscription has expired, and we earnestly solicit your prompt renewal.

Discontinuance—We find that many of our subscribers preferred not to have their subscriptions interrupted in case they fail to remit before expiration, therefore, by authority of the U. S. Postoffice Department, we can extend reasonable credit when necessary, and all subscribers are expected to notify us to stop magazine if it is no longer desired.

FRANK J. BOYER, Managing Editor and Publisher, Reading, Pa.

Collapse of Evolution

By Dr. L. T. Townsend

The new and enlarged edition is now ready to mail.

A beautifully printed pamphlet, with bright, strong, cover, 64 pages. Orders for thousands of them were filled the first week they were off the press.

Dr. Townsend deals our Evolutionists a crushing blow. Get yours—and order a lot to give your friends.

Price 20c each; \$2.25 per dozen; \$17 per 100—Prepaid at these prices.

ALTAR AND RING

A Wedding-Day Souvenir

COMPILED BY G. B. F. HALLOCK, D.D.

There is nothing on the market to equal it at the price. A very pretty booklet, having an artistic, heavy, stiff, white cover, with a pretty up-to-date stamp in Aluminum. Printed on a very heavy enameled book paper and silver edged. Each book is packed in a box, for safe mailing and presentation. Size 6½x7½.

This book is not a mere jumble of poetry, but has an idea running thru it; it begins with suggestions on courtship, then the ceremony, then the congratulations of friends, etc. The poems celebrating the all-important occasions appeal to heart and mind alike in words of tender sympathy and counsel for the newly-wedded pair.

READ THIS

I am much pleased with them; the arrangements are unique, and the selections are very appropriate.—*Rev. Edwin Genge.*

In sending a duplicate order for a dozen of ALTAR AND RING, a prominent minister says: "If ministers only knew what a beautiful book it is, they would go like hot cakes."

Single copy, 50 cents; 6 copies, \$2.50; 12 copies, \$5.00, prepaid. Your money back if you want it.

Other Booklet Wedding Day Souvenirs

BRIDAL SOUVENIR—A brief modern handbook on the relation of husband and wife, 86 pp., white cloth, beautiful gold and tint design, 6x4½ inches. Each in box, 60 cents. Special price, 50c net, postpaid.

THE WEDDING DAY, by Bishop John F. Hurst, D.D., cloth, 60c—special price, 50c. Beautifully bound in white cloth, white gilt edges. Size page, 5½x7. Gives the Service, the Marriage Certificate, and Words of Counsel. Yours, while they last, at 50c. prepaid.

25c Religious Pamphlet Package

Send us 25c for a worthwhile package of timely Religious Pamphlets fully 50c worth, and more! Try one!

CHURCH FURNITURE
Pews, Pulpits, Chairs, Altars, Book Racks, Tables, Communion Ware—EVERYTHING. The finest furniture made. Direct from our factory to your church. Catalog free. DeMoulin Bros. & Co., Dpt. 79, Greenville, Ill.



Typewriter Ribbon

Typewriter Carbon Paper

The Best Ribbon we know of at the price. High grade, non-filling, full length, permanent colors in any climate, perfect edge. Any writer using narrow ribbon, at 75c, prepaid.

The Best Carbon Paper we know of at the price—black, blue or purple. High grade, smooth and even.

25 sheet 60c; 50 sheet \$1.10; 100 sheet \$2. All prepaid.

Sermon Outlines

These Sermon Sketches are available not only for Revival Services, but also for the ordinary preparation for the pulpit. They are Suggestive, Helpful Fresh Gems, and will prove very valuable to ministers in their study.

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 4

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons, contributed by fifty different ministers, aiming at originality and suggestiveness of arrangement, price 50c

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 5

Are by Rev. Wm. J. Stevenson, D.D., singularly original, and suggestive; 60 full Sketches of Sermons, price 50c

Sketches of Funeral Sermons

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons for Funeral Occasions, contributed by fifty different ministers, like No. 4. It also contains fifty carefully selected Texts for Funeral Sermons, price 50c

Sketches of Sermons on the Lord's Prayer

By J. C. Hornberger, D.D. Price, 10c

The Tool Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Pegs of Thought, Sunday-School Addresses, etc., gathered from various sources and grouped together in convenient form for the express purpose of helping to fix upon some suitable subject, thus affording assistance in time of need and emergency.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price 50c

The Seed Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Seed Corps, etc., similar to Tool Basket.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price 50c

"It deserves its name. Open it anywhere, and you will drop on an ingenious arrangement of a subject, a happily selected cluster of Scripture texts, or illustrations for lighting up an address."—Rev. F. B. Meyer.

"Admirable; the sort of thing that is invaluable to busy workers."—Rev. Mark Guy Pearse.

FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading, Penna.

Worth While Pamphlets

Constructive Studies in Matthew, Dr. Gregory, 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for	\$2.50
Constructive Studies in John, Dr. Gregory 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for	2.50
NOTE—West of Mississippi River price for above 2 pamphlets is 40c ea; or \$3.00 per doz. These 2 volumes are of inestimable value to Preachers and Bible Students.	
The Higher Criticism, Dr. Sharaton, 20c Pocket edition, now 15c each, or dozen for	1.50
The Higher Criticism: A Present Appraisal, 10c each, per dozen	.75
Counterfeit Criticism of Scriptures, Dr. Hamilton, 10c edition, now 6 ea., doz.	.50
The Editor in the Pulpit, Dr. Hamilton, 5c edition, now 4c each, or dozen for	.40
Letters on Higher Criticism, Dr. Ridout, 10c edition, 10c each, or dozen for	.75
Biblical Giving, Smith, 5c each, or per dozen	.50

Cloth Bound Books by Dr. Townsend

Published to sell at \$1.25 and \$1.50

Your choice while they last at 50c—
3 books for \$1.25, prepaid

God-Man—Search and Manifestation
Sword and Garment
The Arena and the Throne

ART AND MORALITY

Beautiful, cloth, 81pp; Price 25 cents prepaid

A frank treatise by a popular author on Art as that portion of man's work which is inspired by the love of beauty. The author insists that the artist who deals with human life shall not divest himself of this humanity; and that he shall not conceal his sympathy with goodness and purity and honor. *The Western Christian Advocate* says it is "sterling in sense."

FROM PULPIT TO POOR-HOUSE

Cloth, 204pp. Thousands sold at \$1.00. Will close out at half price—50c.

The Story that made the Old Minister a Pastor Emeritus. Dr. Jay Benson Hamilton's stories that started the Veteran's Movement in Methodism and told by him in over 2,000 churches.

The romance is so real as to be a recital of sad facts with many sad illustrations.—Lutheran Observer.

A pathetic and powerful plea. It cannot help having a profound and lasting effect.—Congregationalist.

We defy any person with a soul to read ten pages in it without laughter and tears.—Nashville Chr. Advocate.

Well worth reading, written in a vivid and sometimes most sarcastic style.—Episcopal Recorder.

A combination of history and romance. It states the case with fiery eloquence, not to say vehemence.—The Independent.

Champion Bound Volumes

We are fortunate to have several Bible Champions from 1908 to 1912 to sell at half price, to close out lot. All cloth bound, and prepaid.

1908, in 2 volumes, per Vol.	\$1.00
1909, only 1 Vol.—Jan. to June	\$1.00
1910, in 2 volumes, per Vol.	\$1.00
1911, and to April, 1912, in 1 Vol.	\$1.00

New Series Champion Bound Volumes

1918, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.	\$2.25
1919, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.	\$2.25
1920, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.	\$2.25
1921, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.	\$2.25
1922, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.	\$2.50
1923, Jan. to Dec., Complete Index.	\$2.50

Bound Homiletic Volumes FOR MINISTERS

Every volume listed below will prove valuable and very suggestive. Each contains an abundance of available material for pulpit preparation for Ordinary, and almost every conceivable Special, Occasion, completely indexed.

Of several years we have only a few volumes left. It will be difficult to procure these volumes after our supply is sold out.

As a test, to convince yourself, order a single volume. There is nothing more helpful; there is nothing so inexpensive!

Bound Volumes of the Preachers Assistant, a Homiletical Magazine, Leather Binding, about 500pp, any volume from 1896 to 1905, prepaid	\$1.75
Any 10 volumes for	\$15.00

Bound Volumes Preachers Magazine, a Homiletical Magazine, all bound uniformly in Silk Cloth, about 570pp, any volume from 1891 to 1901, prepaid	\$1.25
Any 10 volumes for	\$10.00

Bound Volumes The Sermonizer, a Homiletical Magazine, all bound uniformly in Silk Cloth, about 380pp, any volume from 1911 to 1916, prepaid	\$1.75
The 6 volumes for	\$10.00

Bound Volumes The Sermonizer, in enlarged form, bound uniformly in Silk Cloth, about 475pp, vol. 1917 or 1918, prepaid	\$2.25
Both volumes for	\$4.25

We have quite a lot of left over numbers of The Sermonizer—a Homiletic Magazine we published for years. Each number contains Sermons, outlines of Sermons, and many articles of a purely Homiletic nature. The material in every single number is as fresh for use now as at any time. Several numbers of this magazine will be as valuable to a minister as a volume costing many times the price of these magazines.

We will mail them to you at 10c per copy. If 12 numbers are ordered at one time \$1.00 for the 12. Try a few numbers—their value will surprise you.

FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading, Pa.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Volume 30

MAY, 1924

No. 5

EDITORIAL

Evolution

HEY say that in the logic of events the ancient story of Creation has gone into the discard; which is important, if true.

They say that all the worth-while schools and colleges are now teaching Evolution; and if this is correct the fathers and mothers of the rising generation ought to be advised of it.*

They say that since Darwin's time all scientists are Evolutionists; which of course rules out all such small fellows as Dana, Agassiz, Guyot, Dawson, Gray, Winchell and Virchow. And Gilbert Chesterton simply displays his ignorance when he affirms that there are "practically no English scientists who endorse the claim of Evolution in these days."

They say that "no man with brains presumes to defend Creationism any more." This being so, I shall have to proceed with my argument as a man without brains, born blind and bred without books or scholastic culture; my only apology for my presumption being in the ancient proverb, "A cat may look at a King."

If wars were to be won by wind instruments the propaganda of Evolution would have occupied the field long ago with flying banners; but thousands of years have elapsed since the last reliable account of the destruction of a fortified city by the blowing of rams' horns.

*The immediate occasion of this editorial is the fact—called to my attention by an anxious mother,—that a text-book entitled "Ancient Man: a wonderfully delightful History in Story form for Boys and Girls" is being used in some of the very "select schools" of our cities. The so-called History begins in this pleasant way: "The great-great-grandfather of the human race was a very ugly and unattractive mammal. His head and most of his body were covered with long hair. His forehead was low and his jaw was like that of a wild animal. He lived in the damp blackness of vast forests. Altogether he was a miserable creature, in many respects far less attractive than a well-bred house dog. Of the earliest history of this man, we know nothing. We keep track of him through his bones and they tell us that he lived more than two thousand centuries ago. The rest is darkness."

So then, with all modesty and becoming deference to the superior wisdom of younger and wiser men, I venture to offer ten reasons why I for one do not believe in Evolution "as a workable theory of the Universe and the present order of things."†

First, it is not proven. The utmost claimed for it is expressed in the word "hypothesis"; which Webster defines as "something not proved but assumed for the purpose of argument."

The argument begins thus: *Suppose* a nebula in motion, propelled by an unaccountable force and throwing off concentric clouds of star-dust which are evolved into innumerable worlds like ours, in some unaccountable way. Then *suppose* a primordial germ, its origin unknown, equipped with life nobody knows how, evolved itself into countless *genera* of living organisms, including man. All this by the *supposed* automatic or mechanical operation of such natural laws as heredity, variation, overproduction, natural selection and survival of the fittest. The word *suppose* occurs no less than eight hundred times in the two major books of Charles Darwin, buttressed by a formidable array of ifs, perhaps, probablys and it-may-be-sos.

Now this is the Hypothesis. If it were proven we should have to accept it as a matter of course; but mere guesses, however ingenious, do not convince the average man. The advocates of Evolution sometimes call it a "Science." The word is from *scire*, meaning "to know." Knowledge is based on evidence and evidence rules out guesses. Nothing can properly be called scientific unless it rests on established facts, of which there is a total absence in the present case. No Court of Justice admits "supposes" or "progressive approaches" or even "close resemblances" as evidential facts.

†These are the terms used some years ago by the Scientific Congress of Germany in a Resolution rejecting the Darwinian theory.

Second, the Darwinian theory is not only unproven but *positively disproven*; and that in the house of its friends.

There are three things that must be accounted for if Evolution is to command the respect of logical minds.

One of these is the Origin of Species; or indeed the origin of anything; matter, force, the primordial germ, the quickening spark of life. Whence came they? No answer. In every instance the Evolutionist guesses himself into a blind alley, from which there is no retreat except in the confession "I do not know." *Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus?* No, there is not even a "ridiculous mouse" to show for it.

For another thing, it must furnish proof of the Transmutation of Species. Everybody believes in Development within specific lines; but that is not Evolution. In order to justify its claim it must find some of the missing links, at least one. It must cross some of the gulfs between the various orders of living things, at least one. Has it succeeded in doing so? *Not once*. The gulfs between nothing and something and between the multitudinous forms of organic and inorganic matter yawn as wide as ever.

If a man were to spend his whole life in trying to leap a stream and, after ten thousand experiments in progressive approach, had to confess his utter failure to get across, the only reasonable conclusion, it seems to me, would be that it couldn't be done, or at least that he couldn't do it. This is precisely what has happened in the case of Evolution; as even Mr. Huxley was constrained to admit: "Not a single transitional form," he said, "has been discovered as yet."*

Still further; Evolution must produce facts to warrant the long periods of time required. It is alleged, for instance, that man has been evolving for some hundreds or thousands of millions of years. Where are the facts? "The skulls and bones of primeval man." Do these

* "Species are the characters of an incomprehensible alphabet, by the help of which man succeeds in representing all his thoughts, comprehended in that lofty language which the whole creation speaks. The letters are unchangeable; the discourse is ever new."—Agassiz.

"We have, in the fossil remains contained in the rocks, sculptured record of the world, running back incalculably further than the earliest chisel-marks inscribed by man,—incalculably further than man's existence on this planet; and although we find from that record that thousands of species have passed away, and thousands have appeared, in no single case have we yet found the series of transitional forms imperceptibly gliding into one another and uniting two clearly distinct species by a continuous bridge, which can be cited as an undoubted instance of the origin of a species."—Prof. Wyville Thompson of Edinburgh.

show that he was inferior to modern men? "The Engis skull," says Mr. Huxley, "is a fair average skull which might have belonged to a philosopher." All the evidence goes not only to prove that primeval men were of all sorts, high-browed and low-browed, just as they are nowadays, but also that the far away period assigned to them is pure assumption.

A skeleton was once unearthed in an alluvial deposit of the Mississippi delta which set the sciolists all agog with hope. "Here," they said, "is an indubitable case of remote antiquity. These remains were found beneath successive layers of sand, gravel and clay which could not possibly have been deposited in less than fifty thousand years." *Quod erat demonstrandum.* "Let us go on excavating," they said; "who can tell what wonderful things we may happen on?" Unfortunately the wonderful things they happened on further down were the remains of a Mississippi flat-boat.

The futility of such efforts, repeated over and over a thousand times, ought to satisfy any unprejudiced mind that Evolution as "a working theory of the universe" is not only unproved but unprovable. Think of the numberless attempts at "spontaneous generation." To quicken an atom, to produce one tadpole, to reanimate a single dead fly would be conclusive; but if these attempts prove anything, they prove the thing impossible.

The reason why gold-seekers no longer go to Pike's Peak in the hope of finding gold is because Pike's Peak is honeycombed with barren holes dug by gold-seekers whose failures have proven satisfactorily that there is no gold there. The hopes of the Evolutionists have been exploded in the same way.

When Mr. Darwin undertook to prove the transmutation of Species by changing a cage of pigeons into a cage of something else, he succeeded, as he says, in transforming "a pigeon with only twelve tail feathers into one with thirty." But anybody must see that in order to make his point he should have changed the pigeon into a rabbit or something of that sort; otherwise he merely showed that pigeons can only be changed "after their kind." Thus he proved exactly the opposite of what he was driving at.

Why go further with this discussion? "I have eleven reasons," said a lawyer in court, "for not producing my client. The first is, he is dead." "That will do," said his Honor. "We can dispense with the other ten."

Nevertheless, I must go on. Thus far I have argued without any special reference to

religion; merely as a Missourian, so to speak, who "wants to know." Now let me present the case from the Christian point of view.

My third reason for rejecting this Hypothesis is because *it turns God out of doors*. The man who calls himself a theistic Evolutionist has missed, on the one hand, the definition of Theism which is "God first, last, midst and all in all," and on the other hand the definition of Evolution which is "All things by the *uninterrupted* operation of natural laws." If he means what he says he is a man without a country, unacknowledged by simon pure Evolutionists and self-exiled from the Commonwealth of an overruling God.

It is related that when Laplace submitted his *Mechanique Celeste* to Napoleon for criticism, the latter remarked: "I find no mention of God in your philosophy"; whereupon Laplace answered, "Ah, sire, that is the glory of my philosophy; it has no need of God." The same may be said of a theory which undertakes to account for all things by the operation of automatic laws: it leaves no room for God. There is a clear issue between Genesis and Pangensis; we cannot have both.

*Fourth, it reduces Man to the level of the lower orders of life.** "Man," says Darwin, "is descended from a hairy quadruped, arboreal in its habits." It was this statement that evoked from Thomas Carlyle the indignant retort, "This, then, is what we have come to; all things from frog spawn! The gospel of dirt is the order of the day." However, I am not disposed to dwell upon this phase of the question. *Noblesse oblige.* Let those whose family pride permits of such a family tree make the most of it.

But observe where this carries us. If man is to be regarded as a mere creature of circumstance and blind insensate laws, what becomes of all his nobler impulses? If the hope of the future lies in the Survival of the Fittest,

*"In the beginning the Unknowable moved upon the Cosmos and evolved Protoplasm: and Protoplasm contained all things in potential energy; and a Spirit of Evolution moved upon the fluid mass.

"Then the Unknowable said 'Let atoms be differentiated'; and their contact begat light, and their combinations begat air, rock, and water.

"And there went out a Spirit from the Unconditioned and produced the organic cell; and this begat Eozoon, and Eozoon begat Monad, and Monad begat Animalcule.

"And from the Animalcule by progressive steps was at length evolved the Ascidian, and from the Ascidian came the Simidae, and among these the Lemur prevailed above his fellows and produced the Platyrhine.

"And the Platyrhine went into the land of Nod and took him a wife of the Anthropoid Apes.

"And in process of the cosmic aeons were born unto them and their children the anthropomorphic primordial types; and these are the generations of primeval man."—Anonymous.

what is to become of the unfit? There is only one logical answer: let them die, the sooner the better!

The proper thing for Nietzsche to do when he was searching for a colleague in defense of Gothic *Kultur*, i.e., "The Will to Power," was to yoke up with Charles Darwin; which was precisely what he did. And with what result? The most relentless war the world has ever seen! Why not? If the weak must make way for the strong in the interest of the superman and the supernation, then war to the blade and the blade to the hilt! Why prolong the beneficent processes of Evolution by building hospitals and reformatories? The implacable Will to Power must prevail if ever we would welcome the Golden Age!

Fifth, the Scriptures are ruled out of court. Have you ever happened to meet an Evolutionist who was not also a "liberal," properly so called by reason of liberties taken with the Word of God? The story of Creation is explained away as "a poem," and the historical parts of Scripture as "folk lore." The following letter will be of interest at this point. It is dated June 5, 1879:

My dear Sir:

I am very busy and am an old man in delicate health; and I have not time to answer your questions fully, even assuming that they are capable of being answered at all. Science and Christ have nothing to do with each other; except in so far as the habit of scientific investigation makes a man cautious about accepting any proofs. As far as I am concerned, I do not believe any revelation has ever been made. With regard to a future life, everyone must draw his own conclusions from vague and contradictory probabilities. Wish-
ing you well, I remain your obedient servant,

Charles Darwin.

Sixth, all authority whosoever is renounced, except that of the inner consciousness or "Infallible Ego." The Decalogue goes to the rear as a superannuated code of blue laws. The Court of Final Jurisdiction with respect not only to truth but morality is within every man. He is responsible only to himself. In other words, as a mere shuttlecock of automatic laws like the bobbin in a power loom, he is not responsible at all. *Exit character!* For character rests on responsibility. No wonder, therefore, that Carl Marx built his reckless philosophy of Socialism on Darwinism; and Russia, like a ship without chart or compass, has gone down to miserable wreck and ruin upon it.

Seventh, Evolution is defiant of common sense. It asks us to believe in effects with causes, the like of which no mortal man has even seen. It asks us to believe in design without a designer, an assumption which a Waterbury watch or a mere child's rattle puts to shame. It asks us to believe in laws without a lawgiver, when every schoolboy knows that even the rule against whispering in study hours must have a teacher behind it. And if proof be demanded, where is it?

One is reminded of the order once given an eccentric artist to paint a picture of The Israelites crossing the Red Sea, which when finished showed nothing but a vast canvas painted red. "Where are the Israelites?" asked his patron—"They have gone over," and "Where are the Egyptians?"—"They have gone under." The evidences in the case of Evolution are complacently waived in the same way.

Eighth, it is against faith. What is faith? "The substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Faith takes issue with credulity which is believing without proof. Faith is founded on evidence as to things beyond the province of the physical senses, while credulity shuts us up within the circumscription of our finger tips. An Evolutionist is an agnostic* outside of his laboratory and a baffled adventurer within it. The Christian says, "By faith I know God; by faith I understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God; by faith I glory in my birthright as a child of God and by faith I sojourn in a land of promise looking for a city that hath foundations whose builder and Maker is God."

Ninth, Evolution makes Christ impossible. I speak advisedly.

Let any professing Christian who has board-ed this hypothesis have the logical courage to ride to the end of it.

The life principle of Evolution is the calm, automatic uninterrupted process of natural law. There must be no intrusion from any quarter, certainly not by any thrusting in of a divine hand. "The best definition of Evolution," says Haeckel, "is the non-miraculous origin and progress of the universe."* One miracle would break the charm. But Christ

* "I must be content to remain an agnostic." —Charles Darwin.

* "What are the core and essence of this hypothesis? Strip it naked and you will stand face to face with the notion, that not alone the more ignoble forms of animalcular and animal life,—not alone the wonderful and exquisite mechanism of the human body—but the mind itself—emotion and intelligence and will—were once latent in a fiery cloud. At the present moment all our philosophy, all our science, all our art—Plato, Shakespeare and Newton are potential in the fires of the Sun."

himself is the Miracle of all miracles and his pathway through the centuries is lined with miracles.

Where then must Evolution place Him? Obviously in the same category with other men, as one of the products of the chemical reactions which have been going on since the remote period of the lonely primordial germ. This is the only begotten Son of God who claimed to have come from the glory which he had with the Father before the world was.

To admit a single one of the miracles attending his supernatural birth, his wonderful life or his vicarious death, would be a fatal intrusion upon the automatic scheme. The manger, the Cross, the open sepulchre and the great white throne must go. Thus the Christian is left lamenting, "They have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid him."

Tenth, and finally, what compensation have we for this immeasurable loss? Nothing! Nothing for everything! All anchors lost and a south wind blowing where the ship went down!

"Be not taken up in the lips of talkers." I do not say that one cannot profess to be an evolutionist without being an infidel, but I do say that one who really believes in Evolution as defined by its recognized authors and finishers is bound, by every consideration of sound logic, to turn his back upon the Gospel of the grace of God.

It is related that when Mr. Darwin was on his death bed a Christian friend urged him to consider the claims of religion. His answer was, "In my early life I was exercised about such matters; but in the passing of the years, my powers of spiritual apprehension were so atrophied that now there is no response from within me."

You have heard my reasons for declining to be an Evolutionist. As the song says, "I'm little old-fashioned, I know"; but I'd rather be right than lose my balance trying to keep "abreast of the age." It is safer for a planet to revolve in its orbit than to follow the comets in their dizzy flight through infinite space. Let me stake the never ending issue of my life on a "Thus saith the Lord," rather than upon the "I guess so" of sciolists whose breath is in their nostrils. Does this make me a "back number"? Have it as you will. But instead of closing with a word of Scripture, permit me to remind you of what one of our popular humorists has said, namely, "It is much better to know a few things that are so than to know a great many things that are not so." —D. J. B.

Theorizing in a Homiletic Magazine

OTHERS may not have shared our feelings, but it was with something akin to dismay that we picked up *The Homiletic Review* for January, and found that the leading article was contributed by Professor J. Arthur Thompson, and that it proclaimed outright the hypothesis of evolution. That journal is a preachers' magazine. It goes to thousands of Christian ministers. The sad circumstance is that the article is given the initial, and therefore the most important, position. The editors have even gone to the trouble and expense to illustrate it with a drawing (not a photograph) from Arthur Keith's book, "The Antiquity of Man," showing man's "genealogical tree," according to evolution.

And this bizarre picture occupies a full page. It does not represent the first man and woman as created in the divine image—no! It pictures a tree growing up out of the water. At the bottom is one main trunk, which is labelled the "common stem." From this stem all the simian tribes sprang at their proper points of departure, branching off here and there: first comes the stem of "new world monkeys," then that of the "old world monkeys;" further up is the branch of the "small orthograde primates," then the "great orthograde primates;" later come the gibbons, the orangs, the chimpanzees, the gorillas, and lastly human beings appear like sprouts and links. The human stem branched off from the main stem a little below the apes, showing that both apes and men evolved from animals lower in the scale than either.

This picture is arranged in a highly articulated way, but is artificial and mechanical. It is all ciphered out mathematically, too. Evolution is very slow—one might say "pokey." It was 1,200,000 years ago that man was still enfolded in the "common stem." In the text the author says "perhaps two million years ago" (p. 4). So tedious has been evolution's upward movement that fully a million years were consumed in bringing man up from the point where he branched off from the primate stem to the present time. From *Pithecanthropus Erectus* (the Trinil man) to the present required 500,000 years. From the point where the African, the Australian, the Mongolian and the European began to separate was 400,000 years ago.

It was certainly a very humdrum process.

Just what living interest any being, human, angelic or divine, could have had in watching it presents an enigma. It puzzles us to cipher out how people can believe that God would have produced man in that long-drawn way, but some people apparently believe it, and even call it scientific and inspiring.

What we would like to know is, why God should have wanted to make man an ugly savage brute at the start; then why He should have chosen to develop him by infinitesimal degrees, consuming vast periods of precious time. One would think, from *a priori* principles, at least, that God would have preferred to make man good and beautiful to start with, and, since a moral being is the highest kind of being, give him moral freedom, with the power of his destiny largely in his own hands. That is the Biblical doctrine, and to us it seems to be the most reasonable, scientific and inspiring view.

But what about the article which Professor Thompson contributed to the aforesaid preachers' magazine? If it were forcible, convincing and well put, we should be glad to say so; but, candidly, it is about the tamest literary performance that can be imagined. It does not have even the merit of lucidity or logic.

For example, the author thinks that science and religion can be entirely kept apart; that they belong to entirely different spheres of life and thought; that, therefore, you can keep religion in one compartment of life and science in another. But that is as impossible as it is absurd. The Christian religion is a practical religion, and consequently can be divorced from none of the interests of human life. Let us think it through for a moment. You cannot accept one view of things as scientific and hold to a contrary view as religious. The most basic principle of the Christian religion is that it is true. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free;" "I am the way, and the truth, and the life;" "Who will have all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth." If the Bible is not true, God Himself does not want us to believe it.

Now let us apply this principle. Thompson thinks you can carry religion in one compartment and science in another. But suppose they do not agree, can you believe both? For example, this scientist believes in the gradual and agelong evolution of man from the pri-

mate stock; that he was an animal before he became a man, and that his pre-human state lasted much longer than his human state has lasted. But the Bible teaches plainly that man was originally created in the image of his Maker, with whom he at once held intelligent converse. The Bible does not give the faintest hint that he was ever a brute. Indeed, it differentiates him sharply from the whole animal creation (Gen. 2: 18-20).

The question now is, Can any thinking man accept both these views, so diametrically opposed? Can he be "religious" on Sunday, recite the creed, believe the Bible, and worship the Christian God, and then on weekdays be "scientific," and believe that man grew up by long stages from a brutal origin? That is impossible; it is so strained a position that no man can occupy it for long. No; religion and science must agree, if we are going to live and think and act in a consistent and reasonable way.

Our scientist maintains that the theory of evolution does not put God out of the universe. Perhaps not, although it has a strong tendency to push Him far off into the dim background or to hide him in natural processes. There might be deism and evolution. But that is not theism; it is deism, the deism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which practically ruled God out of His universe. Theism teaches that God is both transcendent and immanent. If He is personally active, evolution is nullified; for then God is constantly adding new forces from without to make the process upward moving; whereas evolution means "progress according to certain laws and by means of *resident forces*."

However, Professor Thompson was writing for a professedly Christian journal, and therefore when he used the word "religion," he must have meant the Christian religion, not mere natural theism. But the Bible teaches that the Christian system of truth is a divine revelation; that fact certainly is clear on the face of the Bible from beginning to end. Any other interpretation of the Christian religion is a misinterpretation. If evolution is the true theory of world processes, then Christianity and Christ must come under the same law. But Christ was not evolved; He came into the world from heaven; He was sent by the Father; He was the Word made flesh; God with us; God manifest in the flesh. In it all the supernatural element is dominant.

How does Dr. Thompson "harmonize" religion and science? In a very simple way namely, by casting aside the Biblical record and substituting for it the evolutionary account of man's origin and development! So it is always. Throw the Bible overboard, and then declare, "We must give evolution a Christian interpretation!" Oh, come! let us not play fast and lose with logic and religion in that way.—*L. S. K.*

Whence came our Bible?



FOR several years past we have had common-place statements about the origin of the books of the Bible and the creation of the sacred canon. Some of them have come from those of whom we might have hoped for better things, as they were distressingly free from qualities which accompany any great research into the mysteries, the sense of awe or reverence, of vision, of recognition of peculiar and impressive Providences and of the evidences of what we term Inspiration.

After Jesus came into his resurrection triumph, he met his disciples, and unfolded to them the Messianic messages, "in the law of Moses' in the prophets, and in the psalms," thus placing his seal upon those three great divisions of Scripture which we call the Old Testament. For those who accept Jesus simply as a Teacher, there is no escape from his decision as to the inspiration and therefore the authority of those ancient writings. That was settled by the Master of instruction.

The addition of the books of the New Testament is one of the most engrossing studies known in literature. It was not the work of magic, nor the decision of a single council. Several of the books were slowly admitted, and then by only a section of the early church. Each book was tested by a subtle, sensitive, discerning standard which we call Revelation. Claim of apostolic origin was not even sufficient. The early church insisted on this question in some form; does this book give us a revelation of the mind and will of God? Until that was settled, no book was welcomed. If Scriptural revelation continues, is it not strange that in nearly two thousand years there has not been produced a single document that this church has felt belonged with the volume? The judgment of the early church would not bind us to the New Testament writings as they were then adopted, book by book, were it not that the Providence and

Spirit of God have sealed together these precious documents to the end of time. The more careful is the study of the admission of these books, the more evident becomes the guidance of God given to the early church

and to us. Every urgent question of our feverish modern life is anticipated, and light is offered on the whole programme of living.—*D. S. K.*

A Sermon by Henry Van Dyke

O an evangelical believer a kaleidoscopic religion is a good deal of a Sphinx's riddle. The puzzle is this: How the same man can say such good things in one breath and such erratic things in the next. A case in point is a sermon lying before us, preached on January 13th in the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York, by Dr. Henry Van Dyke, and printed in *The Christian Work* of February 23d.

It will be remembered that Dr. Van Dyke created quite a sensation some months ago by objecting to Dr. J. G. Machen for carrying controversial subjects into the pulpit on Sunday. He went to church, did Dr. Van Dyke, "to worship," not to hear an argument. He wanted the minister to "preach Christ" and "the gospel," not to debate controverted questions. He did not write a private letter to Dr. Machen, and kindly ask him to desist. No; he wrote a letter to the session of the church, and gave it to the press for publication. Nor did the letter show a "sweet and gentle" temper, but rather one that was, to put it mildly, a good deal roiled.

Now note Dr. Van Dyke's beautiful consistency. Did he avoid those mooted questions when he went into the pulpit on Sunday, January 13th? He did not. He dragged in the famous "five points" brought forward and insisted upon by the General Assembly, and criticised them quite trenchantly. In short, he became polemical. Was that consistent? Does it not prove that Dr. Van Dyke in his heart is not opposed to controversy in the pulpit, but simply does not want anything introduced that does not agree with his own way of thinking? In analyzing his sermon from both a homiletical and a worshipful viewpoint, we would say that he "lugged in" the controverted points; that they were not an integral part of his sermon; that they greatly marred its effectiveness for worshipful purposes.

As to Dr. Machen's part in the incident, we are inclined to think that, in a crucial time like this, it would be wrong for a man who is known to be set for the defense of the

gospel and who is capable of doing so by both nature and training—for a man like that to be silent in the pulpit on such vital matters would be wrong. Shall men preach Christ, and yet not defend the very doctrines of Christ that make Him preachable? Dr. Van Dyke's sermon was itself an argument in reply to a young man who objected to his insistence on "the divinity of Christ."

Dr. Van Dyke's sermon contains many good things. He taught that Christ is more than human, and urged some reasons for the doctrine. Much as he dislikes doctrine and theology, his sermon was full of both. The fact is, it was a doctrinal or theological sermon, put in plain language. It was not deep; in thought it was entirely commonplace; but many things were well said, and are vital to the Christian faith. One cannot be absolutely sure what Dr. Van Dyke means by the "divinity of Christ," for some modernists use words in a peculiar sense; but he quotes approvingly the exclamation of Thomas, "My Lord and My God!" And if he does not mean by that the true deity of Christ, his language is not ingenuous, and we would not like to believe that.

Four reasons for accepting the divinity of Christ are given in this sermon. The question is, Why is it not enough simply to believe that Christ was a great and good man, whose teachings one should obey and whose example one should follow? Why must we go further than that? "First," says Dr. Van Dyke, "because the early disciples themselves found it necessary to go farther or else to go back." Christ's teaching and works were of such a character that they had to accept Him as divine or else reject Him altogether. In other words, there was no half-way ground.

In the second place, "faith in the merely human goodness of Christ is not enough, because it is difficult for us to hold fast to it without going beyond it." Here the preacher appeals to the gospel records as the authority for this statement. He quotes from Christ: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." You will see that a modernist will cite texts

of Scripture as authority when they teach what he believes.

The third argument for the divinity of Christ is that, from the beginning, it has been "the corner-stone of the faith" of the Christian Church. It is a spiritual experience, wrought in the first place "by the historic fact of the crucifixion and the resurrection." Here again the appeal is to the gospel records. As the fourth point the preacher urged that "faith is Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Son of man is really the central point, the most precious thing, in the Christian experience." Without it we are still "in the bondage of fear and death."

All this is good, even though it has been said again and again, and often much more forcefully. However, let us see whether our preacher is consistent. At one place he says, "What we want to be sure of is not so much the Godlikeness of Christ as the Christlikeness of God." No; that is not good theology nor is it clear thinking; we want to be sure of both. A little thorough and lucid thinking will show that the Christlikeness of God depends entirely on the Godlikeness of Christ. The epigram may sound smart and original, but it lacks depth.

Let us note another point. At one place Dr. Van Dyke says: "And where will you find the record of perfect sinlessness and moral beauty, save in the story of the historic Christ as it is told in the Gospels? This is the only picture of Jesus that we have. We must take it as it stands. In every line of it we read the assertion of a divine dignity and supremacy."

This sounds very evangelical; but afterward when he breaks out against "the five points" of the General Assembly, he seems to forget how he had previously appealed to the Gospels as the only authoritative record we have. He asks challengingly, "When and where did He (Christ) assert the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, as the Fundamentalists clinically define it?" But that is not the point. The point is this: Two of the same Gospels to which Dr. Van Dyke appeals, and which recite the teaching of Christ, describe in much detail the circumstances of the conception of Christ by the Holy Spirit in the virgin Mary. If they did not report that correctly, how can we be sure that they reported the teachings of Christ correctly? Matthew tells us about the virgin birth. He also reports Christ's sermon on the mount. If he falsified respecting the first, may he not have falsified respecting the second?

The preacher also wanted to know where and where Christ taught the "inerrancy" of the Holy Scripture? We answer, when He said: "The Scriptures cannot be broken;" "They are they which testify of me;" "They have Moses and the prophets;" "It is written" (spoken three times in His fight with Satan); "Have ye not read that it was not so in the beginning?" All these expressions and many others imply that Christ regarded the Old Testament as God's book; therefore inerrant. Christ did *not* "correct the errors" of the Holy Scriptures; He corrected only the Rabbincal misinterpretations of them.

"When and where did He (Christ) say that His mighty works were wrought by His own omnipotence?" challenges this polemicist, who does not believe in dragging polemics into the pulpit. Let Him look at Matt. 9:6 and Mark 2:10: "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins;" John 10:18: "I have power to lay it (my life) down, and I have power to take it again;" Matt. 28:18: "All power (authority) is given unto me both in heaven and on earth;" Mark 6:7: "And He gave them (the disciples) power over unclean spirits." The whole teaching of the gospels is that Christ as divine did "many mighty works;" as human, He was dependent on God for all He did. A clear, full-toned Biblical conception of Christ's person and divine-human nature will harmonize all apparent differences. Any good work on theology will explain the doctrine. Yet Dr. Van Dyke in this very sermon speaks slightlying of theology. A little more study of theology would correct many present-day erraticisms, just as a study of botany would correct men's errors about plants and a study of ornithology would correct crude errors about birds.

The polemicist's mistakes about the atonement and the resurrection of Christ's body are so inexcusable that we will not consume time in commenting on them, except to say that the great Presbyterian Assembly is correct in its definitions and their critic is wrong. We close with one pointed question: How can a man consistently accept the divinity of Christ, and yet say that He might have been naturally conceived and born? If He was thus conceived and born, was He not merely a human personality, after all? And how could He have been sinless and yet been born of sinful parents? Oh, the harm that is done today to the Church of Christ on account of murky thinking!—L. S. K.

Christ Introductions



NE of the things that BIBLE CHAMPION has insistently stood for has been Evangelism. Sermons, articles, clippings, of strenuously evangelistic tone and content, have been plentiful.

Before us is a church bulletin, in notes of which is courteous recognition of five visiting clergymen in the congregation that summer Sunday, of one of whom—a pastor in Kansas City—it is specifically said, "whose session supports him in an ambition not to allow a Sabbath to pass without some one being introduced to the Christ."

Why not? We doubt if there are any sessions in churches that are still evangelical who would not support their pastor in such an ambition. Lack of introduction to Christ in sermons is not due to sessions but to ministers themselves. And what shall be said of those ministers who never, by personal appeal, seek to introduce their unconverted hearers to the saving Christ, or Christ to them?

In an editorial in the CHAMPION last November, p. 523, occurred this: "A man sat under the ministry of three pastors of the same church. In all that time, ranging over eighteen years off and on, he never heard either of them make a direct appeal to the unconverted to repent and become Christians, nor did he hear presented the truths that would tend to produce conviction of sin and make a sinner feel the need of a Saviour."

In a book entitled "Light on Prophecy," among twenty or more discourses is one by the Seattle pastor, the Rev. Dr. Mark A. Matthews, who has the largest Presbyterian church membership in America. Perhaps he gives a clew to his large numbers, for men don't get what they don't go after. He says:

"Christianity is the life of Christ revealed in the life of the redeemed, under the control and direction of the Holy Ghost. Men ask, 'Can you explain how men are born, regenerated, saved, and join the church at every service?' Certainly! That is the purpose of preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ; that is the reason the church doors are opened and the gospel is preached. The minister is fishing for souls. I have often wondered why some preachers preach. They do not seem to be fishing for souls. Some preachers amuse me very much. Generally speaking, the best people on the earth are the ministers. They are the least appreciated, the most un-

derpaid, and the most over-educated crowd on earth. (You laugh at that. I was sincere.) But I have often wondered why men stand up and preach a nice little essay they have made, and then (did you ever watch them?) they close the Bible and say, 'Let us sing'; and after a short prayer and benediction they go out quietly to their homes. Did you ever see a service like that? My friends, it is a crime against the unsaved man in the pew for you to close your sermon, if you preach a gospel sermon, without making an appeal for men to accept Christ. It is a crime against the unsaved for you to close your service without making an appeal for him to accept Christ as his personal Saviour and confess Him before men."

A minister writes us from Florida. On his way thither from the West he made a stop-off in Texas. He says: "At Fort Worth we have a Baptist pastor, Dr. Norris, who has audiences of from seven to eight thousand, and a Bible school of five thousand, of whom one thousand are young men and women in a building by themselves. He makes the appeal to the unsaved at every service, and has many responses every Sunday."

At a meeting of a State Synod (Presbyterian) in the West, one of the imported speakers was a Philadelphia pastor. He had also served rural and town churches. In the *Sunday School Times* of Feb. 23—the "Ministers' Number"—he, with others, gives account of ministerial methods of work and church achievements. He has one of the best organized churches (Bethany Temple) that we know of. Of it as an "organization" he says: "But all this is the human machinery, and is worthless without the Divine power of the Holy Spirit. It would be like a perfect trolley-car, useless unless in contact with the live wire. We preach and teach the old-fashioned Gospel. This is the power that sets the machine in action. This gives us not only special seasons of revival, but makes us evangelistic three hundred and sixty-five days in the year. We expect results at every service. We 'sow the good seed' continually and expect to reap continually. That God has not disappointed may be seen from the fact that we have added six hundred and fifteen new members in the past twenty-one months."

It is the custom in the Disciple denomination for the ministers to make at the conclusion of every sermon the personal appeal and give opportunity to accept and confess Christ

publicly right then and there: We have never heard a Disciple sermon without it. No wonder they are having phenomenal church up-building. They deserve it.

But in some other denominations there is a multitude of ministers who seldom—some never—make such appeal, and who are committing, to use Mark Matthews' phrase, "a

crime against the unsaved."

Brethren, let this editorial stir you up to consider and change your ways. Make it your foremost business to introduce to Christ hearers not savingly acquainted with Him. The Holy Spirit bids you, 2 Timothy iv. 5, "Do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry."—W.H.B.

The Blood! The Blood!

 HERE is an old Jewish legend to the effect that on that fateful night in Egypt when the destroying angel was to pass over the Egyptian homes, there was a young Jewish maid, "the first-born of the family," who was very ill. As the midnight hour approached, she anxiously inquired, "Father, are you sure that the blood is on the door posts?"

"Yes, my child," he answered; "I ordered it sprinkled, and the servant always obeys."

It lacked at length but a few minutes of midnight, and once more the sick girl started up from her uneasy sleep and asked, "Are you sure the blood is there?"

The same answer was returned, but she remained distressed. At last the father lifted her in his arms and taking a light carried her to the door to see for herself, and lo, the blood was not there! Hastily the father killed a lamb, and with his own hand made sure that blood was on the lintel and side posts as had been divinely directed. When the destroyer passed over she was saved; else she had been smitten unto death. The maiden would be sure that she was sheltered behind the saving blood.

The typology of this passover scene, as well as of the divinely ordered Jewish ritual set forth later in the Book of Leviticus has, through the Christian centuries, been held by the scholars and Bible readers generally to have fulfillment in "Christ our passover sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 9). Its plain teaching is that of vicarious, substitutionary atonement, the substitute receiving the penalty due to be inflicted upon the transgressor. In an editorial in *Watchword and Truth*, October 1920, it is said that Dr. Harper of Chicago University "always taught in his Hebrew classes that the principle of substitution was implied in the Old Testament sacrifices and that this same principle passed over into the New Testament in the death of Christ" (p.

232). We have seen it reported that Horace Bushnell, the great opponent of the orthodox view of the atonement, came back at the close of his life's studies to the old substitutionary view. In 1 Peter iii. 18, "Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for (Gr. *huper*, "instead of") the unjust," Meyer observes of *huper* that "substitution is implied." True, Winer in his *Grammar of the New Testament Diction* says: "Huper signifies merely for, for men, for their deliverance, leaving undetermined the precise sense in which Christ died for them" (p. 401). The "precise sense" is the question. A few words can show that the only effectual sense or way in which Christ could deliver men by his redemption work would be to penalty die in their stead. Consider:

All mankind is under moral law. Law, as concerns moral beings, is a rule of conduct enforced by penalty. Law, therefore, is composed of two elements: precept and penalty. Precept tells what to do, and penalty tells the consequences of not doing. Subtracting either element from law, it ceases to be law. In every just law—which every law of God is—both of the elements of law are right. If right, then equity declares it to be right and just that the prescribed penalty should be suffered by the transgressor, and wrong and unjust that he should not suffer it. In the forum of morals, therefore, it is eternally right that it should be suffered and eternally wrong that it should not be suffered. If it be not suffered, then just and righteous law is violated and an eternal wrong is committed. The sinner must suffer the penalty of his sins, inexorably and unescapably so, unless a substitute take his place.

This, plainly, seems to be the logic, the biologic, the theologic, the ethic of the situation. Any atonement so-called, less than this atonement, leaves humanity in a sorry plight. The penalty *must* be suffered. Admit that all mankind is under law—which no one can

sanely deny—we see no way, either rationally or biblically, by which one can successfully evade or avoid this substitutionary conclusion. But attempts are not wanting.

Professor Fosdick in his correspondence with Dr. Clarence E. Macartney speaks of the "governmental theory of substitutionary punishment which was outlawed from every decent penal system on earth long ago."

In the *Auburn Seminary Record* for January 1924, Professor Allen Macy Dulles has a sermon on "The Best Religion," in which he says, "The penal theory which Fundamentalists are again urging, has never been generally accepted by theologians, and it is less so today than ever" (p. 189). (Professor Shedd in his *History of Christian Doctrine*, II. 317, says: "The doctrine of vicarious satisfaction, or substituted penalty, was the *general* form of doctrine among all classes of minds within the pale of the Church, as it was in the Patristic period.")

To Rev. Dr. Milton Evans, president of Crozer Theological Seminary (Baptist) this is credited: "I cannot see anything understandable or acceptable in the theory that my guilt and my penalty were placed upon Christ in any way that involves His suffering for what was due to me."

Says Dr. Reginald J. Campbell, of London: "The belief that Jesus suffered some mysterious penalty and took away sin is a moral mischief."

The death of Jesus has been accounted for in various ways. Some have said that it was only a natural and casual event. Good man that he was, he ran too violently against the sharp prejudices of his times, and so lost his life that way. But to most the atonement idea cannot be escaped, and so some have devised what has been called the federal view of it; and there is the philosophic-realistic view, and the mystic-realistic and the sympathetic-realistic, etc., etc. view. The most

widely accepted view on the part of those who reject the Bible's substitutionary-penal teaching is what is known as the moral influence theory, in which Jesus is made simply a teacher and exemplar and not a Saviour redeeming from the penalty of sin, which otherwise the sinner must himself suffer. As though the example of any one could save another from the penalty of the sins which he has committed!

Modernism and modernistic sympathizers have presumed to say that atonement by blood-shedding is too repulsive to refined taste, too objectionable and gross in concept and expression to be allowed, and the stigma they have sought to attach to it—"the theology of the shambles"—would be laughably absurd if it were not so shockingly blasphemous. If this is not treading under foot the blood of the Son of God and counting it an unholy thing (Heb. x. 29), we do not know how to characterize it.

1. "When I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plagues shall not be upon you to destroy you," Ex. xii. 13.

2. "It is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul," Lev. xvii. 11.

3. "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ," 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

4. "In whom we have redemption through His blood," Eph. i. 7.

5. "This is My blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins," Matt. xxvi. 28, and "Without shedding of blood is no remission," Heb. ix. 22.

6. "The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin," 1 Jno. i. 7.

7. "Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood," Rev. v. 9.

Where there is no blood there is no salvation.—W. H. B.

Truly, the Champion is a splendid magazine—polished, scholarly, progressive, heroic, diversified, spiritual—a chest of jewels, a tonic for the mind and heart of the weary warrior who is fighting for righteousness and truth. It is so beautifully charitable and magnanimous toward its self-conceited foes I have thought the angel Gabriel might come down, take off his tall hat, and say to the editors, "Brethren, thank you!"

Well, thank God, the Old Book is imperishable and irresistible as the law of gravity.

Why isn't the Champion in every Christian home? Every issue is worth more than its weight in gold!

Personally I gather much inspiration from the department of Notes and Comments. Here one hears the crack of the sharp-shooter's rifle. After the fray is over we find the Fundamentalists always masters of the field!—W. MacNicholl, D.D.

Is It a Good Book?

 FEW quotations will be given, and then each reader can judge for himself whether the book belongs to the evangelical class, and whether it may be safely used as a text-book in a Christian college. The book to which we refer is Professor Edmund Davison Soper's "The Religions of Mankind." The publishers (The Abingdon Press, New York and Cincinnati) announce the fourth edition, and call it "the long-waited-for book on comparative religion."

The author is Professor of the History of Religions in Northwestern University; an institution, if we remember correctly, that was founded by one of the great evangelical denominations, whose standards bind it to the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God. If we have not given this university its proper religious status, we shall be glad to make due correction.

Now we turn to Chapter I, under the sub-head, "The Origin of Religion," which is, of course, the pivot of the whole subject, so far as vital Biblical Christianity is concerned. Our quotation begins about the middle of page 29, where the author says:

"Christians, Jews and Mohammedans alike assumed a primitive revelation, and that settled the whole question. They conceived that in the beginning—that means when the first man was created and placed in the Garden of Eden—God revealed to him in some manner the essential truths of religion, such as the existence of God, the obligation to obey him, and the hope of immortality. Thus furnished, he began his career, but when sin emerged, the revelation became hazy and indistinct, and finally was well nigh if not completely lost. The difficulty with this exceedingly fascinating picture is that it rests on no solid foundation of fact. The Bible makes no clear statement which would lead to this conclusion. When man began to play his part, he performed religious acts and engaged at times in a religious ritual; so much is evident, but nothing is said as to origins."

Is that the kind of doctrine to teach our Christian young people in a professedly Christian university? Let every one judge for himself. Let us go back now and analyze the author's statements, to see whether he is scholarly and logical. First he says that "Christians" "assumed a primitive divine revelation." Yes, they did and have always done so. But Dr. Soper says he does not believe this,

as he shows afterward. If that means anything it means that he does not even regard himself as a Christian! Perhaps he is not, yet the publishers' advertisement on the cover of the book states that he has brought to his task, not only "the necessary equipment in scholarship," but also "sympathetic interest and evangelical faith." Is a man evangelical who intimates that he is not even a Christian? Thus do rationalists limp in their logic.

Note again that the author in the above-quoted paragraph rejects outright the Biblical account of the origin of religion, and finds it difficult to suppress a tone of scorn in dealing with it. Thus he proves that, after all, he does not have "evangelical faith," even though the publishers may catch the unwary by stating that he has. Is a man evangelical who begins his book by throwing overboard the plain narrations of the Holy Bible? He says that "sin emerged." It did not, according to the Bible; it was committed by a voluntary act of disobedience on the part of our first parents. What the Bible teaches ought to be fairly stated.

Our author further states that "this exceedingly fascinating picture" "rests on no solid foundation of fact." But the Bible teaches it. So the Bible does not teach fact, according to this writer! "But nothing is said about origins," says our professor, referring to the Biblical account. We do not understand how or why he should have said that. If the early chapters of the Bible do not pellucidly and definitely tell us about the origin of the universe, of life, of man, of religion (which means fellowship with God), of sin, of worship and of sacrificial offerings (see Gen. 4:3-8), then you can place no reliance on the clearest and most positive language that can be framed. Whether people believe the Bible or not, they should represent it correctly.

We quote further from our author (pp. 29, 30): "That man received his religious nature from God is very plausible, but that differs widely from the statement that he came into life with a full set of religious ideas."

We pause here to inquire, Who has ever taught such a doctrine? Does the Bible anywhere teach or even intimate that Adam and Eve possessed in the beginning "a full set of religious ideas"? The challenge is hereby made to cite the passage. And the additional challenge is made to name a single orthodox theologian who ever taught such a doctrine.

The Biblical indicia are clear—that our first parents were created with a *capacity* for religion (communion with their Creator), and that their knowledge of Him was to be gradually developed under His tutelage. The very fact that He instructed them proves, *ipso facto*, that their knowledge was to be progressive. Psychologically speaking, they may have had no "religious ideas" at their creation, but they had the capacity for them, and this capacity reacted to the stimuli when the ideas were divinely suggested, just as the human child today has the capacity to learn to talk, read and write, while the ape and the monkey have no such capacity.

The following quotation (p. 30) gives the cue, as is ever the case, to the author's un-evangelical position: "The theory of evolution presents us with a very different account of early man, an account which makes belief in a more or less complete revelation incongruous. He developed into what he has become, and many ages passed before he was ready to appreciate the truths which, on the other theory, he is said to have received as an original endowment."

This citation makes two facts clear. First, as we have said again and again in this journal and in other writings, whenever a man accepts the theory of evolution, he forthwith proceeds to cast aside the Biblical account of the origin of man and religion. Second, our author makes it perfectly clear that evolution and the Bible do not agree; that you cannot serve two masters, evolution and the Bible. And yet there are professed leaders of thought who think that the Genetical account of origins can be harmonized with the evolution hypothesis.

The author proceeds in this way: "The easy way in which through all the centuries of Christian history thinkers accounted for the non-Christian religions was to refer them to the devil as the author. This was a simple solution of a difficult problem, and it carried the Christian church until the last century or two; but it is too simple to be convincing, and betrays an ignorance so profound that it is hard to be patient with it today."

Of course, that is scoffing. It is also that logical fallacy which is known as the *ad captandum* argument. No doubt Christian people do ultimately ascribe the sin in the world to the devil, but that is very different from saying that everything in heathenism is directly the work of the evil one. The Bible itself teaches that "God hath not left Himself without a witness in any nation." It

also says of the divine Logos, "This is the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Therefore this author's representation of the Christian view is a caricature, and that is the most insidious kind of misconstruction.

However, we must ask seriously whether this professor of the history of religion in a professedly Christian university has also gotten rid of his Satanic majesty. If so, how will he account for the origin of sin in the world? If his theory of evolution is true, God Himself is the author of sin, for, according to that theory, sin consists in man's primitive animalism, and if there is no devil, then God gave man his primitive animalism. This thought ought to have serious consideration.

What the author scoffs at as "too simple" a solution of the origin of religion does not impress us. We cannot see why men should not be inclined to accept a simple, adequate and reasonable solution of their problems instead of seeking for some far-off, obscure cause. In mathematics there are problems that are very simple; there are others that are very difficult. But both kinds belong to the same great science and are valid problems. Suppose a problem can be solved by simple arithmetic, would a mathematician resort to all the intricate processes of differential calculus to solve it? Apply the parable to religion.

Many scientists today are very much afraid—or are they ashamed?—of the *Deus ex machina*, that is, of assigning God as the cause of things; but they seem to have no fear of making all sorts of obscure and unproved guesses about causality. We hold that a personal, all-wise and all-powerful God is the only *adequate* cause of the universe and its varied and marvelous phenomena.

How does our author solve the problem of the origin of religion? He goes to Professor E. B. Tylor (instead of to the Bible), and adopts "the animistic theory." We cannot now go into the argument, but would simply suggest that God pursued a very strange course if He led men to develop the religion of grace and redeeming love in Jesus Christ through so low-down a superstition of fear and thralldom as animistic religion. That would mean that God first led man into gross error and credulity and superstition, and then, after wearisome ages and eons, finally brought him to the truth.

The reader may now judge for himself whether Dr. Soper's book is a good and safe book; also whether it is founded on historical data or on unscientific speculation.—L. S. K.

The Present State of the Church



HE present contention found in all or nearly all of the evangelical bodies is most important. There are three views of this contention. The liberals say that the contention is consistent with loyalty and unity in the church, and nothing should be done to correct it.

The evangelicals hold that the contention is between two parties. One of them holds that the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice, a revelation direct from heaven, perfect and final, and its facts and doctrines are to be received, believed and lived.

The other party denies that there is a divine, infallible, perfect and final revelation, and while the Bible contains much that is good, it also contains much that is bad, and it is for the human mind to determine what it will receive and what it will reject. These evangelicals declare that these views are mutually destructive, and they cannot exist in one organization.

There is a third party who claim to believe with the evangelicals in the infallibility of the Bible, and the obligation to receive and obey it, but they believe that if rationalism is left alone, it will either die out or become harmless. This party always profess belief with the evangelicals, but always vote and work with the rationalists. They are the more dangerous, because they invoke confidence, and then betray it, while the out-and-out liberal or rationalist comes out into the open honestly and squarely, and you know where to find him and how to deal with him. By his very frankness, he warns people.

The present controversy in the Christian church is one of the worst in history for these two reasons: (1) It strikes at every point in the foundation of the church. It seeks to destroy these foundations. (2) The opposition and conflict is within the church. It is not an attack from outside, but a boring from within. Of course, it invites an attack from

outside enemies from the very fact that an enemy always attacks more freely and successfully where there is weakness within.

All the forces of unbelief are profoundly interested in the present conflict in the church, and they always take the side of the rationalists. The rationalists, the middle-of-the-road people, the Laodaceans, or the let-alones, and the avowed opponents of the gospel, are all on one side and against the evangelicals, and that very actively so. It is therefore absolutely necessary that the evangelicals become most active and stand together in solid phalanx.

The attack in the first century aimed at the overthrow of the Christian faith, denying Christ, his atonement, and resurrection, but the battle was carried on outside the church. The church was united on one side and the world on the other. In the second century the same was true. The Arians in their contention accepted the Bible, but denied the Godhead of Christ. Their contention was confirmed to but one point, and this was also outside the church. The same was true of the Socinian contention.

The battle in the sixteenth century with the Roman church was not over the fundamentals, but over certain evil practices, which arose from the loss of the equality and liberty of believers and the doctrine of an infallible church, expressed in the pope and the college of cardinals. Here the battle was within the church, but did not strike the foundations. But the battle today is within the church, and it strikes at every fundamental of the faith. It seeks to destroy the entire Christian foundation and throw us back to paganism. It is therefore the most dangerous of the conflicts, and every true believer must with all his heart and mind contend now, as never before, for the faith once for all given to the saints and for those facts without which there is no Christianity. The truth cannot be destroyed, but thousands of souls may be lost if we conceal the testimony.—D. S. K.

The remarkable manner in which you uphold the authority and integrity of the Word of God should and does cheer the hearts of all Evangelical Christians. May your voice never be silenced. May you continue, by your keen analysis, to lay bare the inconsistencies, subterfuges, and vile slanders of the enemies of our revealed religion. The prayers of the righteous are with you.—Rev. A. M. Mannes.

Dr. Bates' Papers on the Books of the Bible

HE paper on the Book of Revelation printed in our April number, is the last one we have in hand. If our count be correct, there have been 30 articles in all, 16 on Old Testament books and 14 on New Testament books. Possibly he may be able to furnish us still more, on omitted books.

Of course these papers have been made out of sermons he has produced in the regular course of his ministry. We have heard him say that, so far as he knows, he is the first pastor in this country to preach sermons on the Books of the Bible, taking a whole book in a discourse,—a practice that has come to be quite common. His idea of it and incentive came from an article in the Princeton Review on the Book of Mark, by Rev. Dr. Daniel S. Gregory who long after became Editor of our Bible Student and Teacher. He began it in January, 1873, which was the time of the beginning of the International Sunday-School lesson series, and he has continued it through the years.

It is very evident that such discourses have cost an immense amount of hard work; but to one who remarked as much, he replied, "What are ministers for if not to do hard work?" Fortunately he has had pastorates in which his people would not only endure such intensive presentation, but would—as they say of children and castoria—"cry for more"! so that the announcement of a sermon on a Book of the Bible would appeal to his own people and often bring Bible students from other congregation. Many have said he has made the Bible a new book to them.

What we have published has been only the didactic part of the sermons, the homiletic part—the practical lessons—not being given. In preaching them, while his hearers have not been able to escape considerable instruction, his paramount purpose has always been to derive spiritual benefit and furnishing for practical life for his people, and often the lessons, with the swing of a whole Book behind them, would come with great impressiveness and force. We have reason to believe that many of our readers have found them of very great value, and compared with the Outlines published in many books, these Introductions and Analyses have been far more full and informing than most of them. An Eastern University professor, who reads proof for us, returning the Epistle to the Hebrews (Feb. 1924), wrote us: "Dr. Bates' article on He-

brews is *good*. I think he has done a real service in that direction. There is enough to *prove* the Pauline authorship, I think, unless a man shuts his eyes to it. His analyses are worth preserving in book form."

For the benefit of those who have preserved their magazines and who may wish to use this matter in the future, we have made a careful examination of the indexes and are able to present the following schedule of places where the Books may be found:

1920. Genesis, July; Exodus, August; Leviticus, September; Numbers, October; Deuteronomy, November; Job, May; Ecclesiastes, June.

1921. Joshua—the Book, January; the Man, February.

1922. Esther, April; Ezra, March; Nehemiah, May; Psalms, January; Proverbs, February; Hosea, June-July; Amos, October; Haggai and Zechariah, November; Matthew—the Book, and the Man, Aug.-Sept.; Acts of the Apostles, December.

1923. Romans, January; I and II Corinthians, February; Galatians, March; (Ephesians was in January 1919); Philippians, April; Colossians, May; I and II Thessalonians, June-July; I and II Timothy, and Titus, November.

1924. Philemon, January; Hebrews; February; James, March; Revelation, April.

Freedom from Dogma



S we sit on the bleachers and look down into the arena where the present religious controversy is waging, we are quite often amused.

For instance, a headline in a New York daily newspaper says: "Dr. Grant, Dr. Potter, and Dr. Guthrie Protest Against Bondage of Dogma." Drs. Grant and Guthrie are bellicose Episcopal clergymen in New York City, and Dr. Potter has broken from Baptist bonds into the freedom of Unitarianism.

Dogma!—that is an awful word, *i.e.* for some men; and that is where the fun comes in.

In the Aug.-Sept. 1923 BIBLE CHAMPION was an editorial on "Dogmatics" (p. 391), in which it was said that "Dogma" is a transliterated pure Greek word derived from the verb *doko*, to think. So one who *thinks*, and gives utterance to his thought or expresses an opinion, utters dogma. In the

domain of religion it has for synonyms the words, doctrine, tenet, proposition. Says Newman in his Grammar of Assent, 'A dogma is a proposition; it stands for a notion or a thing, and to believe it is to give the assent of the mind to it.'

So these gentlemen want to get rid of the bondage of thinking! Quite so, quite so. And the editorial goes on to say that men can escape doctrine or dogma only by ceasing to be clear headed or by ceasing to be religious and that some in their haste seem to be trying to escape by both ways at once, and with remarkable success.

And we have been impressed, as the controversy has continued, that the output of the Modernist mind is characterized by utter lack of clear, logical, definite thinking. To be sure Modernists can claim pre-eminence for fine rhetoric and fluent verbiage. Yes, *fluent* is the word. The dictionary defines "flue" as a channel or passage for hot air. And that is what they are giving us—hot air. They may think they are thinking when they are only blowing tumid wreaths of fissurating vapor.

We have just been reading of a modernist who can deny the facts recorded in Scripture and yet hold the spiritual truths those facts inculcate! What sort of a mentality is that? How can a spiritual truth come out of an unspiritual lie?

Their antics and pedantics have precipitated in our mind another name for them: Modernists are Muddleists. There isn't a doctrine wherein they differ from the old conservative, fundamental faith—the faith of the Church that has been deduced by the thinking of the centuries—that, from a biblical standpoint, they have not muddled: not one. When it comes to honest, consistent, sane, patent biblical exegesis, the Fundamentalists have an easy walk over: they have it all their own way. Modernists, to use both a classical and Scripture phrase, are "not in it." Real thinking would impose limitations that would cramp altivolant ambition into bondage.

Oh, yes, these gentlemen and their like protest against the bondage of dogma. There's a reason.

Hares Chewing the Cud

N the first editorial in March BIBLE CHAMPION was solved the difficulty which the pastor of the West Side Unitarian Church in New York City, Rev. Dr. Charles Francis Potter, in his debate with our Contributing Editor, Rev. Dr. John Roach Straton, adduced to invalidate the truthfulness and reliability of the Bible. It was the case of Michal, Saul's daughter and David's wife, having "no child unto the day of her death," and yet having "five sons" (2 Sam. vi. 23, xxi. 8).

Another Old Testament difficulty that Dr. Potter brought out was the allegation that hares chew the cud, Lev. xi. 6, when it is a fact of natural history that they do not chew the cud. Request has been made for the solution of this difficulty.

In 1903 the writer published a book, "Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible," in which he essayed to crack hard nuts of Scripture difficulties, and, if the judgment of book reviewers and biblical scholars can be depended upon, the effort was far from a failure. Among the characters in the book were Miss Rysen, a successful Bible class teacher, two young men who had come up under her teaching, Fred Leges a young lawyer, and George

Argent, a young bank teller, who repeatedly visited their pastor for his help in the treatment of difficult Bible questions. The book has long been out of print, and the solution of the Hare question will here be transcribed from what is there given, since it just fits the present situation.

On a given evening one of the difficulties considered, besides the Hare question, was the Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart. The substance of this, in another form, was given in an article in August 1920 CHAMPION, page 311. We now transcribe the cud-chewing episode:

A sort of solemn hush seemed to fall on the little group as George slowly uttered his last sentence: "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" but the irrepressible Fred quickly rallied and said, "It is my turn now." With rising gleefulness he went on: "Yesterday the president of the Agnostic Club came up into the office, and I saw he was 'loaded' for something. Said he: 'My festive and pious young scion of human and divine law, do you like Belgian hare meat?' I couldn't imagine what was coming, but I replied: We had some up at our boarding-house today, and I thought it fine. 'Well, do you know,' said he, 'that according to the Mosaic die-

tetic laws in Leviticus xi. 6, a hare is unclean and so not fit to eat? It reads: *And the hare, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof, he is unclean unto you.* But then, as Moses made a mistake in regard to the hare chewing the cud, maybe the rest doesn't count."

Fred continued: "I bridled up with, How do you know Moses made a mistake? 'Well, well, sonny, I see I must take your 'edication' still further in hand,' he said exasperatingly. 'I've tried to bring you up right. Attention. It is a first-class physiological or anatomical fact that ruminant animals, cud chewers, have four stomachs. The first, the rumen or paunch, receives the coarse food, where it undergoes a softening process; then it passes into the second stomach, the recticulum, the honeycomb-like arrangement of whose mucous membrane rolls it up into balls, which, by a spasmodic action, are regurgitated, one by one, into the mouth for complete mastication. That is 'chewing the cud.' The food masticated, it is swallowed into the third stomach, the manyplies or omasum, from which, after some trituration, it filters into the fourth stomach, the abomasum, for perfect digestion. See? Now, it is another first-class fact that the hare has not any such quadri-stomachic aggregation, and therefore cannot chew the cud. That Moses made a mistake—*quod demonstrationib*—what d'ye call it?"

Fred went on: "I said hotly, why, I have seen hares chew the cud many a time. Cowper, the poet, tells of his favorite hare, Puss, which he often carried into the garden where 'she hid herself, generally under the leaves of a cucumber vine, sleeping or chewing the cud till evening,' and when the little fellow died he wrote an 'Epitaph on a Hare,' of eleven stanzas. 'All I've got to say is,' replied the Agnostic, 'that you and that other heavily minded chap are simply mistaken. Hares are rodents, gnawers, and the appearance of chewing the cud is only their grinding their teeth together, after the manner of rodents, to wear down their rapid growth, so naturalists say.'"

The little company was convulsed with laughter over Fred's somewhat dramatic recital. The trio turned their eyes to the pastor.

He straightened out his face and said, "Oh, that difficulty is an old acquaintance of mine. Several years ago a publisher sent a work for me to review, in which a theological professor took very much this position of the Ag-

nostic, but of course not in the Agnostic's coarse style. I said to myself, if the Bible tells lies about hares, how can we know it tells the truth about heaven? A boy over on the far side of the town kept a rabbithry. I visited the place and said to him: Do rabbits chew the cud? He said 'yes.' Are you sure? He was very positive. I offered him fifty cents if he would prove it to me. We went to the pen, and there the little fellows, after a hearty meal of clover, were chewing away as for dear life. My offered half-dollar did not procure the evidence I wanted. Said I to the lad: You catch a rabbit by the throat, squeeze him so tight he cannot swallow, get the cud out of his mouth, and I will give you five dollars. He did not win the money. Some subsequent dissections did not confirm the boy's or Cowper's assertions."

"What!" exclaimed Miss Rysen, "is it so, that hares do not chew the cud?"

"I am afraid not," said the pastor; "I am afraid not."

"Well," said Leges and Argent together, "how did you come out?"

"I used my common sense," said the pastor. "It is well known that modern scientific knowledge of ancient natural history is in a very unsatisfactory state. For instance, take the animal whose skins were used in making a covering for the tabernacle, Ex. xxvi. 14,—'badger's skin.' Says Murphy: 'The *tachash* is variously conjectured to be the badger, the seal, the dolphin, and the *tacasee*, a species of antelope found in Africa.' So high an authority as Dr. Edward Robinson would render it *dugong*, a swimming animal known in the waters of Arabia. Take again, for instance, the word *yemin*, in Gen. 36: 24, used but this once: 'Anah found the *mules* in the wilderness.' But the Revisers translate it, 'Anah found the *hot springs* in the wilderness.' Quite a difference between mules and hot springs! The old translators did the best they knew when they translated it 'mules'; but they didn't know. So the *arnebeth* in Lev. xi. 6, and in the parallel passage, Deut. xiv. 7, rendered 'hare.' There is practically but one occurrence of it,—a small foundation to build on. The translators, in their little knowledge, or lack of knowledge, said 'hare,' which is an animal that does not chew the cud. But Moses said the *arnebeth* did chew the cud. Shall we set up the ignorance of elapsed centuries against the knowledge of one then present on the ground? The easy and common sense solution of the difficulty is simply this: the *arnebeth* was an animal known in

Moses' time to chew the cud, but which we in our ignorance, have not been able to correctly identify and have no means of identifying. I can hardly assent to Moses' knowledge being overthrown by modern ignorance. The mistake must be in modern men and

not in the ancient Moses. That is the conclusion I came out with, which satisfies me."

"So it does us," the trio agreed, and with the added knowledge of the evening they went their homeward way.—*W. H. B.*

Appropriative

N the *Encyclopedia Americana* is an article on Spiritualism by E. D. Babbitt, M.D., of the "Institute of Higher Science," Geneva, N. Y. He is a spiritualist. He speaks of "Christianity especially being one of the great revivals of spiritualistic influence." He claims as spiritual mediums Hesiod, Homer, Zoroaster, Confucius, Laotse, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Cicero, Swedenborg, Beethoven, Mozart, Raphael, etc., etc. Indeed Christ has been claimed as a spiritual medium! Dr. Babbitt seems to appropriate about everything in sight.

This power of appropriation brings to mind the appropriativeness of the sons of Dwight L. Moody—Paul, president of Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., and William R., president of the Northfield (Mass.) schools—both of whom claim their father for the Liberals.

Early in January William R. spent a little time in Cleveland, Ohio. In an interview he is reported to have said, *Plain Dealer*, Jan. 12, "My father was a conservative in theology, as I am, but he was liberal or tolerant and broadminded toward other men. I am sure today he would find more in common with Harry Emerson Fosdick of New York than with those who denounce Mr. Fosdick."

This son's conservatism which he claims does not seem to be of the 100-per cent brand, for he was advertised to preach the next day in the "Church of the Covenant," of which Rev. Dr. Paul F. Sutphen is pastor, the church that is reported to have cast out Fundamentalist teachers from the Sunday-School; and he seems to consort where he goes, with that sort of people. The fact is, both sons are playing into the hands of the Liberals.

In the Life of Dwight L. Moody, by his son William R., at page 580, is this: "Mr. Moody had his prejudices, for I once heard him declare that he would own fellowship with everybody that believed himself to be a sinner and trusted in Christ; but, said he, 'God being my helper, I will never own fel-

'owship with a man who denies the deity of my God and Saviour Jesus Christ or sneers at His atonement."

That doesn't sound very "liberal."

In the Radio Broadcasts department of the Philadelphia *The Presbyterian*, Jan. 24, the broadcaster says: "Indeed, Mr. Moody was severely censured when he once refused to sit on the same platform with a noted Unitarian, saying that he drew the line when men attempted 'to take the crown from the head of Jesus Christ.'"

That doesn't sound very "liberal" or "tolerant."

We have seen it reported that Mr. Moody declared that he would not allow a man to preach in a pulpit that he had control of, who denied the Jonah story.

That does not sound very "liberal."

Here are four specifications—his attitude towards those who deny the deity of Jesus Christ, who reject his atonement, who disown him as the Son of God, who deny the Jonah story which He endorsed with His sanction, all of which reprobations (and much more) are part and parcel of Modernist vagaries—that should forever refute the claim of Dwight L. Moody for present day liberalism. He cannot be appropriated thus.

It is well known that the senior Moody was very, very scrupulous about admitting only sound, *i.e.* orthodox, men to the Northfield platforms, and that when the once most welcome Henry Drummond went astray access was closed against him. A man who denied the foregoing four specifications would certainly have been a *persona non grata* there. Now it is different. The then pastor of the Northfield church told us that W. R. relaxed the standard so as to accept men if they were particularly popular with the public, and that once when an Oberlin man was put on the program because of his great popularity in addressing young people, the "old guard" would not stand for it and the engagement was cancelled. The descent of Chautauqua

from the salubrious heights of the Bishop Vincent administration down to the low miasmatic levels of the liberal Shailer Mat-

thews regime (see editorial "Chautauqua," Aug.-Sept. 1923 CHAMPION, p. 402) may well admonish Northfield.

Potter in Favor With Infidels

 N obliging anonymous friend has sent us several copies of a rank infidel sheet published in New York. It has many laudatory words to say of Dr. Charles F. Potter, the Unitarian preacher who has been having theological tilts with our good and staunch friend, Dr. John Roach Straton. We wonder whether Dr. Potter feels complimented by what his infidel friends are saying about him. He really has been hobnobbing with them, and so he must not be surprised if they speak well of him and try to identify him with themselves. Here is what the paper above referred to says of him:

"The minister (Potter) has long been an admirer of Paine, and the arguments he advanced in his famous debate indicate his familiarity with the great author's theological writings."

Of course, we knew that Potter's arguments were not new or original, for the present writer read them long years ago, even before he was out of his teens, in Paine's "The Age of Reason." Dr. Potter is so much of an admirer of Paine that he joined the infidels in a dinner given in honor of the famous infidel. Here is what the infidel paper has to say about this quondam preacher:

"The noted Unitarian minister, Dr. Charles Francis Potter, was the principal speaker. To most church people he is the Paine of this age, since for the time being he is accused of doing more than any other man to discredit the Bible and orthodoxy. His subject was: 'Is 1924 the Dawn of the Age of Reason?'"

Note this too: "One speaker said that Dr. Potter should come out of the church. A free-thinker defended the doctor somewhat by testifying that Unitarianism contains so little

of Christianity that, like near-beer, it is almost harmless." Says a correspondent: "A gentleman offers me a brand new dime for a paper, and before I recognize who he is, I remark that if they can preach atheism in the pulpits, I certainly have a right to sell it on the streets. My victim this time was the Rev. Charles Francis Potter."

The editor of the said infidel sheet feels terribly *miffed* because the judges decided the debate on evolution between Dr. Straton and Dr. Potter in the former's favor. The decision is a sign of popular prejudice, he thinks. The point is that the infidel is an ardent advocate of evolution, as are all the infidels. Here are a few excerpts from Potter's eulogy on Paine at the Paine dinner: "Surely but slowly the heretics become saints. America is building her own religion, and the first great prophet of that religion was Thomas Paine. We do not need an imported religion from the orient. The Carpenter of Nazareth would bow down to Thomas Paine as one of nature's noblemen. . . . 'The Age of Reason' is one of the best attacks ever made on the infallibility of the Bible. I recommend it to Dr. Straton for his education. Paine was the father of Biblical criticism."

There is more of the same kind in this distressingly irreverent periodical, written by professed infidels, but we find nothing more daring and sacrilegious than the utterances reported from the lips of the Unitarian preacher. If he lands in the camp of the infidels, it will be because he has simply "gone to his own place." He has gotten into the company of his own confreres. "Birds of a feather will flock together." But why does he want to remain even in the Unitarian church? We wonder whether they are proud of him.—L. S. K.

I'm for the Champion

All the way up; all the way down;
All the way through; all the way 'round.
Sidewise, Likewise, and otherwise!

It has nerve and grit, backbone, and iron in the blood! I am for such a journal and the kind of men who stand for and edit it. The religion and truth for which it stands, I stand. Indeed I'm proud of the Champion and read it with great delight and much soul-applause. I often wish the editors could hear my soul shout its approval at some of their great blows landed upon the heads of Modernists.—R. S. Patterson, D.D.

Walter Duncan Buchanan, D.D., LL.D.



E are very glad to announce that Dr. Buchanan has consented to become a Contributing Editor of the BIBLE CHAMPION.

In New York City every one belonging to the Presbyterian denomination knows who Dr. Buchanan is. It is our pleasure to introduce him, in a few words, to those members of our family who do not happen to live in that city.

Dr. Buchanan's ministry began in the Seventh Avenue Chapel of Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, which later united with Old Thirteenth Street Church, now Greenwich Presbyterian Church, where he ministered until his call to the pastorate of Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church, in 1899.

In 1911 Fourth Avenue Church sold its property at 22d street and removed to its present beautiful new edifice, at 114th street, in 1912, changing its name to Broadway Presbyterian Church.

Since assuming the pastorate of Broadway Church, 25 years ago, Dr. Buchanan's work has been one of constant and extending growth, and throughout his ministry he has been widely known as a preacher of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and a believer in the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures.

Dr. Buchanan's church is situated just opposite the University of Columbia and large numbers of students attend upon his ministry. For ten years past he has made it a point to occupy his pulpit throughout the summer sessions of Columbia University, and despite all weather conditions he has had audiences that crowded the large auditorium.

Dr. Buchanan is the recognized leader of the Conservative party in the New York Presbytery and will doubtless be quite a prominent figure before the country at the coming sessions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in connection with the Fosdick case.—F. J. B.

Notes and Comments

That Jesus was not all suavity is proved by many facts in His earthly life. In Him is the perfect combination of gentle and stern qualities. He loves, but He can also grow indignant. He said, "Come unto me," but He also drove the money-changers from the temple. He is "the Lamb of God," but also "the Lion of the tribe of Judah." The apostle John speaks of "the wrath of the Lamb." "Loving kindness does not make up the whole of his character," says an acute writer. "Love can become indignant; it can turn itself into consuming fire; it can smite and destroy. Some Christians are so gentle that they never fight evil or help to overthrow the wrong. The power of love and indignation are equal." Some one who knew the great and good preacher, Dr. F. W. Robertson, writes: "I have seen him grind his teeth and clench his fists when passing a man who he knew was bent on dishonoring an innocent girl." Some one has said: "May not moral neutrality sometimes degenerate into neutral morality?" Says another: "To love God and virtue is synonymous to hating the devil and all his works."

Think of the mental and moral caliber of a writer who is capable of putting the follow-

ing in print and of the editor of a popular literary magazine who would accept it for publication! He is writing about the Holy Inquisitors of the Roman Catholic Church, who engaged in persecution centuries ago. Then he adds: "Today their kindred spirits are attempting to forbid the study of biology, and they would put us in irons and send us to prison if we expound comparative anatomy!" A man who is capable of such puerility ought to take a course of study in a district school ten miles from a railroad. And yet the writer is Ellwood Hendrick, Sc.D., (which means "Doctor of Science") and the periodical that publishes it is *Harper's Magazine* (December, 1923). Such crass ignorance of the spirit and views of conservative Christians is almost criminal and altogether pathetic. The writer perhaps would better be sent to an asylum than to a prison. Who today objects to the teaching of biology and anatomy? There is no such a person on the earth, especially no Christian person. Again and again orthodox writers have praised the work of real scientists who stay by the facts. It is unproved speculations to which they are opposed, and especially to the teaching of them as if they were empirically established facts. We grow weary of this childish whim-

pering about being "persecuted." Stand up like men and fight back without blubbering, you scientists, and you will at least win the respect of the people! We assure you that nobody is going to hurt you! How many centuries has it been, any way, since there was any real physical persecution? These plaintive scientists give us the impression that they have no manhood at all! Why, Polycarp, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and even the two noble women, Perpetua and Felicitas, went to their death as Christian martyrs without a word of complaint and without showing the white feather.

We have read the whole article referred to in the preceding paragraph. It is a most unconvincing plea for the theory of evolution. You cannot prove the theory of natural evolution by referring to what has been done by intelligent human efforts to breed fine horses, cattle and dogs. Man can develop many species of animals, but that does not mean that nature left to herself would achieve the same results. The evolutionists hold that evolution is the law of nature, and was operative millions of years before man with his intelligence came upon the scene; indeed, they contend that man himself is the product of natural evolution. Well, then, we are looking for a concrete instance where *nature herself* evolves a lower form of life into a higher form. Yes, just one such an instance.

Says the doctor of science just cited, in closing his article: "The great need of humanity in these days of wrath and selfishness and malice is religion. We need above all things a sense of divinity to enliven our consciousness of our obligations." We agree to these statements. But what kind of logic does the writer use? If evolution is the dominant law of the world, how is this beautiful religion of which the writer speaks to be evolved out "of wrath and selfishness and malice"? Can something so fine evolve out of something so coarse; something so good evolve out of something so evil? If we need "a sense of divinity" above all things, how is it going to evolve out of the non-sense of divinity? If this new sense of God must come down from God—and whence can it come but from him?—that would not be evolution; it would mean a supernatural act. We are glad, though, that the writer feels the need of religion, but we do not believe that true religion would lead him to accuse Christian believers falsely, as he did when he said that they were opposed to the teaching of biology

and anatomy. It is so much easier to preach than to practice.

The following facts are taken from Dr. Samuel H. Kellogg's valuable "Handbook of Comparative Religion," pages 34 and 35. He says that in extreme antiquity the Chinese recognized the existence of a Supreme Being known as Shang Te. Professor Robert K. Douglas, in his "Confucianism and Taoism," says that at that early time, "in the eyes of the emperor and people Shang Te appeared as personal God, directing their ways, supporting them in affliction, and chastising them for their faults." But what happened as time went on? Did their views evolve into higher and higher views of God? Not at all. Listen to Professor Douglas again: "But as time went on, the distinctive belief in the personality of Shang Te became obscured, and he was degraded from his supremacy to the level of the impersonal Heaven." Confucius came centuries later, but never mentioned Shang Te, and never enjoined his worship, although he sanctioned the worship of spirits and ancestors. Why does not evolution help its votaries a little better?

It is difficult for a modernist to carry on a simple logical process even on matters of common ethics. Rev. Arthur C. Baldwin, in an article in the February number of *The Homiletic Review*, furnishes pertinent proof of this fact. He tries, by a winding process of reasoning, to justify men who hold views contrary to the standards of their church in remaining in the church, eating at its table, sharing its emoluments and honors, and yet either keeping silent as to their real beliefs or speaking out against the church doctrines. How does he reason the case? By contending that the heretics hold views on such minor points that they think they can keep mute without doing violence to their conscience or call in question publicly the doctrines rejected. But if they are of such small import, why has the whole Church of Christ been thrown into turmoil over them? Have the modernists been preaching so many irritating sermons and writing so many irritating books about mere bagatelles? If so, they have done a great wrong to the cause of Christianity. But the mooted doctrines, like the deity of Christ, the atonement He wrought, His virgin birth, His bodily resurrection, and His visible second advent are not indifferent matters to the church, and all of them have been expressly taught or clearly implied in the standards of all the Protestant denominations.

No; an honest, straight-forward course does not need to be bolstered up by meandering processes of reasoning, which usually contain more or less of sophistry.

The Bible presents a full-orbed system of truth, and that makes it most satisfying to both the intellect and the heart. It tells us whence the universe came, what is its purpose, what shall be its destiny. Surely that is a large view, and is most winsome. It tells us whence man came, why he is in the world, and what shall be the eternal outcome of his being. Origin, purpose, destiny—is not that most satisfying? The opening chapters of the Bible tell us about Paradise created and lost; the closing chapters tell us about Paradise regained. Is not that a satisfying system of truth?

We have heard a preacher say, after delivering his sermon: "There! I am glad I have that out of my system!" Brethren, let us never speak in that disrespectful way of our sermons. If they are true gospel sermons, we ought to try to keep them in our system. Besides, if we have no higher regard for our sermons than to speak of them in that way, what impression will they make upon our hearers? Let us remember that there is no greater joy than the delivery of the gospel message to dying men and women; neither is there any greater privilege or responsibility.

Much is said today about "progress." But the theory of the evolution of man certainly implies sickeningly slow progress. He advanced by infinitesimal steps. It took him millions of years to move up from the primate stock to the humanoid stage. Running for millennia on all-fours like an ape or monkey, in some way he gradually formed the notion that he could walk on his two hind legs; and it took him about a million years to learn to walk in that way! So says our friend, Van Loon. What tedium! It can hardly be called "progress." One is almost compelled to say that man, according to evolution, is ultra-conservative. Yet we are called hard names, especially "non-progressive," if we do not believe that man was such a "slow-poke" in evolving. To our mind, six thousand years—or, at most, ten thousand—was plenty long enough for man to reach his present poor stage; yes, even then he must be said to be pathetically slow. But if man has been so tediously and obstinately conservative in the past, how does it happen that he has made such marvelous "progress" as to accept the

theory of evolution within a short span of fifty or sixty years—that is, since Darwin made his discovery?

The thought has come to us that some people have a kaleidoscopic religion. They appear in one pattern today; tomorrow the tube is turned and they show another pattern. Their theolgy is variegated. One time they say that they accept the Bible as the "only infallible rule of faith and practice;" shortly afterward the kaleidoscope is twirled, and they are insisting on the "errancy" of the Bible. Now they declare that Christ is divine; anon they are trying to reduce him to human proportions. Such a kaleidoscopic religion may be showy at times, but it is not something that can be relied on.

The humble Christian may meet with things in the Bible that puzzle him sorely for a time; and he may feel that he has found the good Book in error. However, he does not decide hastily; he remembers that he is himself very fallible. So he investigates further. Presently he finds that, after all, the Bible is right and he is mistaken. Does he feel humiliated when this occurs? No; he is delighted when the Bible corrects his own faulty thinking. He wants a mind that is wiser than his own to guide him. He would feel "all at sea" if there were no such a directing mind whose thoughts are higher than his own.

Another quotation from Dr. Samuel H. Kellogg's great little book, "A Handbook of Comparative Religion," speaks for itself: "In the primitive Vedic religion of India, there is much which reminds us of the Christian doctrine of the necessity of a divine atonement for the forgiveness of sin." Then he quotes: "Do thou, by means of sacrifice, take away from us all sin;" "The Lord of creatures gave himself for them; for he became their sacrifice." Then Dr. Kellogg continues: "But these ancient conceptions, so marvelously near the truth set forth in the gospel, have practically disappeared from modern Hinduism. . . . In these days the ideas of atonement and substitution are not commonly connected with the sacrifice. It is, instead, regarded either as an offering for food to the god which is worshipped, or in order to the placation of some angry demon." Here is proof, not of evolution from the lower to the higher conception, but of devolution from a higher to a lower. So it is in all the religions that can be historically investigated.

It is the same pitiful, old, shop-worn and shelf-worn story—every man who flies off on a theological tangent proclaims himself an evolutionist. When will the Christian people of our land get their eyes open to this fatuous result? Bishop William M. Brown, at this writing summoned for a heresy trial by the Episcopal bishops, said in a writing over his own signature in the *New York Times* that "the history of religion is continuous from the savage upward, and it is the history of an evolution." He swallows the lucubrations of Frazer, Tylor and others. He adds: "From the savage to ourselves there is no break, one phase of religious belief has given place to another, and there has been the same revolt and the same resistance to change at every step." And what is this bishop's belief? That a supernatural or spiritual God is only a symbol; that the only god is *matter*. Here is his exact language in response to something said by Dr. Tyson (another liberal, but not so far gone over to apostasy): "The universal matter is as much my god as the universal spirit is his." Remember this man who regards matter as the only god is a champion of evolution.

However, with Bishop Brown—named in the preceding paragraph—evolution is the same old tedious, humdrum process. In commenting on the fact that he has been summoned for trial on the charge of heresy, he says sadly: "Heresy charges are at this day almost enough to make one despair of human nature. They compel us to realize how near we are to the stone age, and how very thin is the veneer of civilization we have taken on. The fact is, we are in for a reaction toward tyranny all over the world." It should be remembered that Dr. Osborn, the eminent scientific advocate of evolution, says that the stone age was about twenty-five thousand years ago. Truly evolution is a slow process; it fails to be progressive. Suppose we give Christ a real chance. He can make men "new creatures" in a short time. See what he did with Paul, with Justin Martyr, with Augustine, with Luther, with Bunyan and Rowland Hill. Give Christ the right of way, if you want to see real and appreciable progress. Evolution is too fearfully slow.

Far too many scientists, it is sad to say, are thinking and investigating on a low plane. They are wedded to the physical. They are enamored of the animalistic. It is the kingpin of their philosophy of the world. To think in psychical, ethical and spiritual terms is be-

yond them; at least, so it appears. Here is a fact in proof. Drs. Dudley J. Morton and Williams K. Gregory, both eminent in science, have been making a painstaking examination of the gorilla's big toe, to see whether they cannot find some resemblance between it and man's big toe, and thus prove that the gorilla is man's great-grandfather. So with these scientists *big toes* bulk very large. Man's soul does not count much in these investigations. His reason, his self-consciousness, his aspirations after high ideals, his conscience, his freedom and moral agency, and his soaring spiritual faculties—all these are lost sight of in this microscopic dissection of the gorilla's big toe! What if it *should* be proved that there are points of parallelism between the big toes of man and the simians? It would not prove evolution. It would simply prove that God made the gorilla's foot to suit his place and purpose in the world; while he gave man a foot to meet his particular purpose. Resemblances may not indicate evolution at all; they may simply mean that God has a unified plan and has made the world an orderly world.

How well the person who has imbibed the true spirit of the Word of God reasons on spiritual subjects! Rev. H. T. Chilvers spoke with much effectiveness at the great London meeting last December in the interest of the full inspiration of the Bible. After showing clearly how much the world needs the Bible, and how impossible it would have been for human wisdom to discover the deep truths revealed therein, he turns the picture and presents another balancing fact, showing how fully God has met man's needs. He says: "But then, while God has revealed Himself in a Book, He needed a personality wherein and by whom He might reveal Himself. I speak reverently when I say that it was an impossibility for God to reveal Himself in merely etymological terms. God could not speak all that was in His heart and all that was in His mind for you and me, and so, in His infinite mercy, and in the economy of His grace, He appointed One co-equal, co-eternal with Himself; for no one else could have spoken for Him; no one else could have revealed Deity as He was revealed to us; no one else could spell and interpret grave but One co-equal and co-eternal with God. So, in the countless ages of the past eternity, God chose Jesus Christ, His well-beloved Son, who is the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world." This is good spiritual

interpretation. Thank God for me who have experienced the fulness of the gospel of redeeming love through Jesus Christ.

So it appears from the New York papers that Dr. Charles F. Potter, the Unitarian belligerent, intends to form a Bible class to meet on Sundays to debate about things. Its motto is to be, "Truth at any cost." The chief object seems to be to pick out flaws in the Bible and show how errant it is. In this high-sounding program, advertised with many a flourish, there is not a word said about saving people from their sins. The work is to be "constructive" in the sense that "science and evolution" (the phrase seems to imply that "science" and "evolution" are two different things) are to be taught as "the infallible rule of faith and practice." We wonder how many sinners will be converted through Dr. Potter's critical methods. We venture to say not one.

We are not much given to alliteration, but we are impressed by a recent writer's use of three great and all-important R's. They are: Ruin, Redemption, Restoration. That spells the whole truth, the whole system of Christian doctrine for man's salvation. First, Ruin through the sin of man; second, Redemption through the purchase-price of Christ's most precious blood; third, Restoration to righteousness and fellowship with God.

People who object to the virgin birth of Christ because it involved a biological miracle, which is objectionable to the "modern mind" (Fosdick), are not consistent. They hold that Christ was sinless. But note: if He was humanly begotten, God would have had to perform a biological miracle in order to prevent the transmission of sinfulness from His parents to Himself. What advantage is there in substituting one miracle for another? And where is the logical consistency in doing so? The modernists ought to study the laws of consequential thinking. Their "long hold" is not logic; it is hasty conclusion and dogmatic assertion.

A writing like the following from the pen of a correspondent of an evangelical paper makes us sad. Speaking sarcastically of a "religious weak book" list, and including Van Loon's and G. Stanley Hall's last books, in that list, he adds just as sarcastically: "Also all books written by and about both 'fundamentalists' and 'modernists.' 'A plague on both your houses!' we say with Mercutio." How a man with an earnest evangelical spirit

and with any real concern for evangelical truth can take such an offensive attitude toward the fundamentalists, who are defending and upholding the very faith for which the said denomination stands, is both a psychological and spiritual conundrum to us. What would the church be today if it were not for defenders like Justin Martyr, Athanasius, Luther, Knox, Orr, Green, and many other divinely chosen vessels? Oh! in these crucial days let us not get astride of the top fence-rail, and let others fight our battles for us!

At the great London demonstration on behalf of evangelical religion, Dr. Dinsdale T. Young, always pithy, had this to say: "I am delighted especially, as I look round this gathering, to see such a number of young men and women, because evidently somebody is mistaken in their estimate of that aspect of evangelicalism. We are told that all who hold to the old views are archeological specimens." This is not so, he held; then he added: "One of the grandest features of our day is that the intelligent youthhood of our churches, and I say it advisedly, is enlisting more and more numerously and more and more cordially under the banner of the old view."

Maud B. Booth, who has taken such a deep interest the past 28 years in the prisons of our country, has requested us to bring to the notice of our readers the great need for Bibles for prisoners. The Chaplain of one of our largest prisons, that at Jefferson City, Mo., is anxious to place a Bible in every cell in that large prison. The Bible Society has just sent 25 Bibles to this institution but there is need for many more. Some of these prisoners have never read a Bible, but in the hour of their disappointment, disillusionment, and despair long to turn to it for hope and comfort. She requests that those having an inclination to share in this work send one or more Bible to Chaplain I. P. Langley, 523 Capitol Ave., Jefferson City, Mo. Since some of the men have failing sight it is suggested that Bibles with clear type be selected. "I was in prison and ye came unto me."

A patron of the CHAMPION writes us: "I am a reader of *The Christian Century*, the ably edited Modernist journal published in Chicago. A friend has sent me a copy of the Moody Bible Institute Monthly, in which he has an article. I find in a single number of the Institute Monthly more religion, i.e. the Christian religion, the religion that makes

for the salvation of the unsaved, than in a whole year of *The Century*." Oh, *Century*, you ought to do better than that! Yet, according to what is quoted from you in the March CHAMPION, page 126, under "A Clarifying Statement"—"Christianity, according to fundamentalism, is one religion; Christianity, according to modernism, is another religion"—what better can be expected? Modernism, denying regeneration, as it must according to its principles, for that calls for the intervention of the supernatural which modernism rules out, has no Bible salvation in it; so why should it trouble itself about that?

The Rev. Dr. William Norman Guthrie, rector of St. Markes-on-the-Bouwerie, New York City, is at loggerheads with his bishop. William has introduced dancing into his church as a part of eurythmic religious services,—"interpretive," you know—and Bishop Manning forbids. Having enough of his congregation to stand by him ("Bowery Boys"?)—this saltatory spiritual (?) guide defies the bishop. Now he is at loggerheads, or should be, with all people outside a bug-house. As reported in the papers, in his Sunday sermon, February 17, he deliriously broke forth, characterizing our Lord as a "mad Jesus," and said, "Christ did not care for the veracity of his statements. He did not care whether or not a thing was possible. He was an artist and he spoke as an artist. He spoke in parables and sometimes the parables were improbable and even naughty."

Isn't that rather hard on artists?

Bobby came in sobbing because his little girl playmate had pulled his hair. The mother gasped: "Why, Bobby, I thought she was such a nice little girl that she would not do a thing like that." "I thought so too," wailed Bobby, "and that's why I kicked her." The Fundamentalists were peaceably and sweetly going on about their legitimate business, preaching Christ, winning souls to Him, up-building saints by teaching them Bible doctrines—doctrine is in order to duty—for inward Christian experience and outward life. Modernists began to "go" for them, for their the Modernists clothed their unorthodox ideas in orthodox verbiage. It involved a disregard of time-honored creeds, of beliefs long Bible, and for pretty much all that they hold dear in Christianity. Rolin Lynde Hartt, a Modernist—and he ought to know—tells how their trick was to be turned: "Accordingly

since written into prayer book and countless hymns, of dogmas still held sacred by the rank and file of Protestantism. It never entered their thoughts that suddenly orthodoxy would rise and fight for its very life." The Modernists are getting undeceated, as did Bobby when he kicked the girl. It is a case of Christianity or no Christianity, a "fight for its very life"; and when it comes to that, the Fundamentalists—the quiet, amiable, peace-loving Fundamentalists—will pay their respects to Bobby. Oh, they are on the defending job all right, and for keeps. Let not Modernists forget it.

We are getting some interesting reading in *The Congregationalist* these days. The Editor-in-Chief conducts a "The Editor's Bible Class." One session was on "Scholarship Gave Us the Bible." We are impressed, by his showing, that the Old Bible is a pretty poor thing. But he says, "Each man, in reality, makes or chooses his own Bible." His denomination has, according to latest statistics, a membership of 838,271. If each one chooses his own Bible, they must have a good many Bibles. Of course each differs, presumably, from the others. But if he means only a "man" achieves this feat, then allowing, as is usually estimated, one-fourth of the membership to be men, there would be 209,592 and 3/4 different Bibles. And if it is "scholarship" that does this, there must be a good deal of scholarship around there. Congratulations.

This is interesting.

In the same issue of *The Congregationalist* (January 31), the Rev. Dr. George A. Gordon, pastor of the Old South Church in Boston, has a sermon in which he says: "I have great sympathy with them"—i.e. the Fundamentalists—"but my sympathy takes pretty much the form of compassion; they know there is something precious in life and they want to conserve it, but they do not know what they want to conserve; they are inadequate in intellectual discernment and in insight, open-mindedness, tolerance, patience, hope." What a lot of boos the Fundamentalists must be! And he says: "About the infallibility of the Bible. Every educated man knows that that is simple nonsense. Its infallibility is not a question to interest any enlightened man today unless he wears the green goggles of traditional orthodoxy."

And this is interesting too.

But we are wondering what sort of goggles are astride the Gordon nose.

THE ARENA

Osborn on "Evolution and Religion"

By Leander S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio



THIN little book—you might call it a bookling—under the above title has been issued by Charles Scribner's Sons and has been written by Henry Fairfield Osborn, the well-known advocate of evolution. It was written in reply to Mr. Bryan, and was first printed in the *New York Times*, and is now sent out in booklet form.

It is a very disappointing production. Since Dr. Osborn undertook to answer Mr. Bryan in this public way, we wonder why he did not try to do so in a thorough-going style. The gist of the whole book is that the theory of evolution is believed by the majority of the scientists, who are the only people capable of forming a judgment, and therefore it must be true. That is the papistic way, not the scientific way. The scientific way is to present the evidence, not to make high claims and dogmatic assertions.

Dr. Osborn says that his essay is not meant to prove evolution. But why not? That is what we are waiting to see proved; that is what Mr. Bryan in his address in New York and his article in the *Times* requested—some real empirical demonstration of the theory. Merely to make *ex cathedra* statements gets us nowhere.

However, we are going to examine some of this evolutionist's statements to see whether they can stand before the bar of reason and in the light of facts. First, he ventures into the realm of religion, or, rather, of theology, and at once proves himself a novitiate in that great discipline. We are wondering, anyway, whether he has ever read a first-class scientific treatise on dogmatic theology or apologetics. There is Ebrard's monumental work of three large volumes, "Christian Apologetics, or the Scientific Vindication of Christianity"—we wonder whether he has ever read a work like that. Then there are the great scientific and philosophical works of James Orr, Dean Wace, George P. Fisher, E. Y. Mullins, A. H. Finn, Bishop Ingham, and many more—how many of these works have the evolutionists studied and mastered to make sure that they can speak and write with full knowledge of theology? They hold

—and Osborn does this in his booklet—that the rest of us, not being technical biologists, are not competent to pronounce judgment on evolution; then are they capable of saying the final word on Biblical interpretation and theological doctrine? Yet Dr. Osborn ventures to give the world a hermeneutical rule by which to interpret the Bible—that is, that we need not interpret it literally where it does not agree with evolution, and that we need to accept only its "spiritual" teaching.

In order further to frighten the layman from daring to say anything adverse to the prevailing evolutionary cult, Dr. Osborn criticises John Burroughs and Dr. Albert Bateson for some things they have said about the inadequacy of Natural Selection to account for the developing process. Says our author: "If it is difficult for biologists to think straight on this very intricate subject of evolution, how much more difficult must it be for the layman?" Our reply would be, if it is so difficult and abstruse as that, it is of little practical value to the world, and so we do not see what is the use of insisting so desperately upon it. Besides, anything that is so very elusive and intricate cannot be definitely proven to be true, and so no one has a right to speak dogmatically about it.

To show how great scientists differ on these "difficult" matters, we quote again from Osborn's booklet: "I have elsewhere shown in a recent number of *Science* that Bateson is living the life of a scientific specialist, out of the main current of biological discovery, and that his opinion that we have failed to discover the origin of species is valueless and directly contrary to the truth."

Really that is a bold thing for one scientist to say of another. It is neither modest nor gracious; it sounds conceited. If this vital question of the origin of species must not be touched except by a very small coterie of scientists, then it is too much of a "star chamber" business for democratic America. We maintain that both John Burroughs and Albert Bateson had a perfect right to have their say on the subject, and so have other people who have given long and intelligent study to the subject.

Again, Dr. Osborn appeals to the consensus of scientists as proof that the theory of evolution is established. To use his own method, we appeal to the main body of scientists against his view (p. 4) that Natural Selection is "the only cause of evolution which has thus far been discovered and demonstrated." Many scientists today hold that the Darwinian theory is inadequate. Who is right? The most recent guesses of the scientists that we have read (within the last few months) are that certain "glands" are the secret of man's progress, and the lack of these "glands" is the secret of the ape's ultra-conservatism. Who is right?

Our author ventures into the field of religious biography. He cites three theologians on the side of evolution. That certainly is a brief list. First, he refers to Dr. James McCosh as a believer in evolution. Dr. McCosh did go further than most of his contemporaries. We remember very well the stir he created, and how he had to fence with all his might to get himself out of his difficulty. But he was a poor kind of an evolutionist. He would not rank at all with the Osborn-Conklin school. He believed in many special creations along the way, namely, of life, of the outstanding organic types, and of man—all special creations—while within certain limits there might have been something of the evolutionary process. Besides, he unfortunately used the term "evolution" in an elastic sense, even to designate the progressive steps of creation described in the first chapter of Genesis. Thus with him evolution meant progress, however it was brought about. But that is a difference of poles from the evolutionary theory of today.

As for Charles Kingsley, all persons who are posted know that he was more of a story writer—"Westward Ho!" "Alton Locke," "Hypatia," etc.—and a preacher of religious essays than a trained theologian or a technical scientist. It has been a long time since we have seen any reference to him as an authority either in theology or physical science.

Appeal is also made to Augustine to put a further quietus on any inquiry on the part of the layman in regard to physical science. Augustine gave the sensible advice that the Christian should not talk about things in science of which he had little or no knowledge. Certainly! but the great church father never meant that the Christian should not inform himself about such things, so that he could speak accurately about them. This whole effort on the part of the evolutionists

to fence off their little plot of scientific inquiry, and say to all others, "No trespassing," is un-American and papistic. They are teaching their doctrines in the schools supported by the taxes or gifts of the people, and then are saying to those very people, "Don't tramp on the grass! These are private premises!" We repeat, that is un-American!

To try to hold on to the Bible with one hand, while throwing it aside with the other, is a trick of spiritual legerdemain in which no man can succeed. Let us see what happens with our evolutionist's efforts. He regards the Bible as "a perpetual source of inspiration, of religious consolation, and the most permanent foundation of conduct" (pp. 10, 12). Yet he girds at the idea that man was "made in the image of God in one day" and that woman was "made out of the rib of man." It strikes us that it would be a strange book that would be so helpful in a spiritual way, and yet would be so childishly mistaken regarding one of the most vital problems of life, the origin of man and woman. Surely that problem belongs to the "spiritual" sphere if any problem does.

Listen again to our scientist's theological *dictum*: "No child should be taught that the Bible tells the story of nature as it has been revealed to us through two thousand years of observation, and especially during the last one hundred years."

What, then, should the child be taught? The Bible is the children's book. It is found in all our homes. Fathers and mothers, Sunday School teachers and ministers are expected to teach it to the children. What are they to tell, then, in beginning the study of the book which is to be their "spiritual" guide through life and to an eternal destiny? Must the parent begin by telling his children that this great "spiritual" book, which comes from God, made egregious blunders in the very beginning? We believe it would be better for the scientists to leave the method of Biblical instruction to Christian parents, teachers and pastors, who are specialists along that line.

The evolutionist, turned religious dictator, continues: "There was no curiosity of nature (he means *about* nature) among the writers of the Bible, as there is little natural curiosity among orientals today. It was not until the book of Job was written, about 450 B. C., that we find the guiding precept of the naturalist, 'Speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee.'"

Do these statements, made categorically, display much knowledge of the Bible? How

does Osborn know that Job was written so late as 450 B. C.? He has seen the statement in some liberalistic critic's book, and has looked no further. Was there no curiosity among the Hebrews about nature until 450 B. C.? The first chapter of Genesis, written centuries and centuries earlier, tells us about the creation of the whole physical cosmos, including the primordial material, the origin of life, the many species of plants and animals, and last of all the introduction of *Genus homo* on the scene. That would seem to indicate a profound interest in nature. Adam was directed to name all the animals. He must have had some "curiosity" concerning them, for the names that he gave were to be their permanent names. Some scientific interest is connoted there. Abraham was bidden to look up into the heavens and number the stars if he could. There is the indicium of natural curiosity long before 450 B. C. And so on through the Bible until David exclaims (Ps. 19): "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork." Dr. Osborn seems to have gotten quite out of his field when he undertook to instruct people in Biblical lore. It is plain that he does not accept the Bible according to its honest literal sense; no evolutionist does—not one, not one. We challenge anybody to produce one. Dr. Osborn even admits that Mr. Bryan is "absolutely right" when he says that evolution finds "no support in the Bible."

Very sure of his thesis is the evolutionist. The Vatican could not speak more *ex cathedra*. We quote a number of *dicta*. Evolution is "the plan and the only plan of nature;" "all species of plants and animals originated in this way;" "man has ascended from the ranks of nature" (p. 14). "In 1922 it is the most firmly established truth in the universe" (p. 8); "The immutable truth of evolution" (p. 4); "Evolution has long since passed out of the domain of hypothesis and theory . . . into the domain of natural law;" "Evolution takes its place with the gravitation law of Newton" (p. 16). "This is not guess-work; this is a fact. It is another fact which we will have to accept regardless of the effect" (p. 19).

Here is assertion upon asseveration. What proofs are offered? More assertions. Still, the author does refer to several matters as evidence of evolution which it would be unfair to omit from this discussion. He says (pp. 17, 18): "It would not be true to say that the evolution of man rests upon evidence as complete as that of the horse, for example,

because we have only traced man's ancestors back for a period of 400,000 years, as geological time was estimated in 1893 by Secretary Walcott of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington; whereas we have traced the horse back for a period of 3,000,000 years, according to the similar estimates of geologic time."

There he stops. But is that giving proof of evolution, merely to make such an assertion? How do the evolutionists arrive at their conclusions respecting the calculation of time? By assuming that evolution is true, and then estimating how long it would take for things to evolute. On the face of it, is it not going pretty far to say what took place three million years ago?

Elsewhere we have dealt with the *hippus* (horse) data of the evolutionists, and have exposed their *non-sequiturs* respecting it. So we will not repeat the argument here. But we will add another suggestion or two. The Eohippus is usually regarded as the first of the horse series of animals. It really is link No. 2, for it was preceded by another little creature (with a jawbreaker of a name), of which only the skull has been found, "so that it has not been exactly determined what its feet were like." Then how do they know that it was the ancestor of Eohippus? But what was this last-named creature? It was smaller than a squirrel, and its fore-foot had four complete toes and its hind-foot had three. And this little creature the evolutionists are *sure*, was the progenitor of the modern horse! And to add to the absolute certainty of the thing, the horselet lived 3,000,000 years ago! Some months ago we saw a scientist's moving-picture exhibition of the little Eohippus. It had four quite long and slender front toes, and it was holding them down straight and was trying to walk on their tips! Why did it want to walk on its toe-tips? Echo answers, Why? That certainly would have been a very awkward and painful way of going about. But it seems that it was determined, *sans rime et sans raison*, to be the ancestor of the modern horse, and so it and its descendants actually persisted in walking on their toe-tips for 2,000,000 years, until they had evolved the Orohippus; but behold, this creature, after two million years of strenuous effort, still had "four complete and usable toes" in front "and three in the hind-foot." But some progress had been made, for this creature had attained the size of a small dog. We cannot follow him through all the details of his course; but he persisted through another million or more

years in walking on the tips of his toes, until all the side-toes, gradually reduced in size, finally disappeared altogether, while the central toe gradually increased in size and became ossified, until at last it evolved into the horny hoof of the modern horse! It is out of such "solid facts" and such "scientific observation" that the theory of evolution is proved! And we are called "ignoramuses" and "obstructionists" if we do not swallow the theory!

Dr. Osborn appeals to the Foxhall man, found near Ipswich, England, as "the most convincing answer to Mr. Bryan's call for evidence." But what are the evidences presented by Dr. Osborn? Well, the Foxhall man "lived long before the Ice Age." He could walk erect; had hands and feet like our own; had enough intelligence to construct various kinds of implements, to kindle a fire, to make flint tools and to dress hides for clothing. This is "the convincing evidence." Our reply is, you may go to Central Africa and Australia today, and find people who live in just as primitive a fashion. So the Foxhall man may have lived in the far-off hinterland, while Egypt and Babylonia were in the midst of a flourishing civilization. Yes, even in our civilized country and under our flag, there are people who are living in very primitive surroundings. The status of a tribe's civilization affords no clue to the age in which its people live or lived, as long as we see peoples of all grades of enlightenment living contemporaneously. And, moreover, since any one can see case upon case of degeneration among nations and tribes, and no one can find any case of their evolving from paganism into monotheism and Christianity by resident forces, the evidence is all in favor of the view that the Foxhall man and his kindred (if he had any) were a degenerate type of the human stock, because of their wandering so far away from the centers of civilization.

There is another place in which Dr. Osborn fails to make the logical connection. After briefly treating of the Foxhall man (pp. 18-20), he says (pp. 20, 21) that the Piltdown man is still nearer to us; the Heidelberg man still nearer; next the Neanderthal man; "nearer still the Cro-Magnon man, who lived about 30,000 years ago, our equal if not our superior in intelligence."

Now note: If the Cro-Magnon man may have been "our superior in intelligence," then we have proof of degeneration right before our eyes. Then why may not all the types which were lower than the Cro-Magnon man

be instances of human deterioration too? The fact is, the evolution theory cannot be maintained. It is not substantiated by fact and observation, and it will not stand the test of clear reasoning. *A priori* it is absurd, and is not proved *a posteriori*.

The contention is made by Dr. Osborn that evolution does not necessarily lead to atheism. That we are willing to admit; although there is statistical proof (see Dr. Leuba's book) that it does lead many of its adherents to adopt the atheistic or agnostic position. There is something about it that inclines people to lose the sense of the personal presence and power of God. It seems to push Him so far into the background as to make Him of little account in human life and experience. The sense of the supernatural is lost in the over-sense of the natural.

However, we admit that men may consistently hold to the deistic view—that is, that God originally created the primordial material, injected into it all the forces and laws needed for its development, and then forsook it. Given the first creative act, evolution might follow. But in that case God would have had to make the machine first, and then ever afterward keep hands off; for if He continued to operate personally on and in the material, He would constantly be adding new energies and principles from without to make the process progressive. But that would not be evolution. It might be development, but not evolution; for evolution means progressive changes by means of resident or inherent forces according to certain fixed laws. If, as Dr. Osborn contends, Natural Selection did it, then God would have had to step aside and let Natural Selection do the work.

Now if scientists concede that God performed so marvelous a miracle at the beginning as to create the primordial material of this vast universe, why might He not have performed some smaller miracles along the way? And if He did that, the best explanation of the beginning of anything new, like life, species and man, is by divine creation; since something never could have evolved out of nothing, or something higher out of something lower. It is also true that Deism had its day—you might say its heyday—in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and proved itself abortive. It will follow the same course now. It will land either in agnosticism or in atheism. That is its natural tendency.

But even if evolution were consistent with natural theism, it is not consistent with Bibli-

cal or Christian theism. The Bible clearly teaches—if it teaches anything clearly—that man was created directly in the divine image, and that God at once spoke to him, and gave him specific commands, definite work to do and a definite place to fill. The Genetical narrative can in nowise be reconciled with the gradual evolution of man from a sub-ape or primate stock. Besides, Christ is the center of the Christian system; and surely He cannot be the result of an evolution from an

animal ancestry, coming up through a terrific struggle with wild and ravenous beasts for his existence. And still further, Christ endorsed the teaching of Genesis I, which says that God originally created mankind “male and female.” Upon that sacred narrative our Lord based the divine institution of monogamous marriage. Hence evolution does not agree with the teaching of Christ, our Lord and Saviour.

Professor Thompson's Articles

By Dyson Hague, D.D., Wycliffe College, Toronto, Canada

*“Hear the other side!” is a well-known piece of advice, and yet when Conservative writers endeavour to get their side represented in publications that are open to the Critical position, they often find themselves shut out. Why is this? It might be thought that fairness alone would lead to the presentation of both sides. Is it that the Critical school is either contemptuous or else afraid of Conservative scholarship? Whatever be the explanation, the instance now given of Dr. Hague's experience tells its own story. It is a matter of great surprise and deep regret that a magazine like *The Homiletic Review*, which is presumably intended for all ministers, should refuse to allow the Conservative view to be presented in its columns. But truth cannot be set aside in this way. In the old words,—“Truth is mighty and prevails.”—Editor.*

 N the month of November last, *The Homiletic Review* began a series of articles by Professor John Arthur Thompson, Regius Professor of Natural History, Aberdeen University, and Editor of *The Outline of Science*. The articles were very frank in stating the evolutionary theory of man's origin and development, the first being entitled “Man's Place in Nature.”

The second article, which appeared in the December number, was entitled “Science and Religion,” in which Professor Thompson laid down the theory that science and religion “may clash in form, but in idea they are incommensurable.” “Scientific concepts are empirical; religious concepts are transcendental.” “The analytic, genetic, matter-of-fact methods of science lead to conclusions which cannot be tampered with.” But, he says, “if, on the other hand, the religious mind pins its faith on some particular form which trenches on the concrete, such as the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, as ordinarily stated, then science, in turn, may be forced to protest.” In fact, he practically takes the attitude that a Christian teacher or preacher has no right to interfere with their theory and

teaching of evolution. It's a matter of science, and religion has nothing to do with it.

In the January issue, he discusses “The Ascent of Man” and while he says “there is no possible way in which science could disprove God,” he gives the current view with regard to a man being a *natural* emergent (we underline “natural”), as a probable mutation or transilient variation from a Simian or primate stock, and he gives that well-known diagram of Keith in “The Antiquity of Man,” of man descending with the Eoanthropus and Pithecanthropus from the great orthograde primates, with the Old and New World monkeys, from the common stem in the eocene of 1,200,000 years ago.

The writer naturally felt that it was only fair that the other side of this question should be put forth to the readers of *The Homiletic Review* and he wrote this to the Editor asking him if he would publish a rejoinder.

27 Maynard Avenue,
Toronto, Canada.
February 21st, 1924.

Dear Mr. Scott:

I am sending you another article with regard to Professor Thompson's articles, which

I hope you will publish. I am sure that you want to have both sides of any important subject presented to your readers, and I believe that there is a very good, if not a very large, proportion of ministers who would like to hear the other side. I feel confident that the attitude of "The Homiletic Review" will be that of absolute fairness and that, as a journal, you could not take the position of the obscurantist who opposes criticism and throttles those who, in a spirit of honest investigation, wish to test all things, and hold only that which is good. I would be grateful if you would let me know, within the next few days, how soon you will be able to publish this rejoinder.

I have, as I said before, published many works in the Old Country and on this side, and am at present, in addition to my parish position, a Professor in *Wycliffe College*.

With the kindest regards,

Faithfully yours,

Dyson Hague.

The Editor declined, however, to publish it, and wrote

New York, Feb. 25, 1924.

Doctor Dyson Hague,
27 Maynard Ave.,
Toronto, Canada.

Dear Sir:

Concerning the article which you sent to us entitled *PROFESSOR THOMPSON'S ARTICLES—A REJOINDER*, permit us to say that when Professor Thompson's articles were published in the *Review*, we felt that there might be some of our readers who would like to read an article covering the same subjects but treated wholly from the standpoint of religion. In the February number of the *Review*, page 116, mention is made of this fact. We communicated with several leading men in the religious world for such an article and we were able to state in the March number that Bishop Francis J. McConnell would write such an article for the *Review*. In view of that fact we regret our inability to accept your article. We must also say that the article to us is disappointing even as a rejoinder.

Yours very truly,

The Homiletic Review.

Robert Scott.

It now appears in *THE BIBLE CHAMPION* in the hope that not only the readers of *THE BIBLE CHAMPION*, but many readers also of *The Homiletic Review* will be able

to see what the writer thinks is a fair and honest rejoinder to the articles of Professor Thompson.

Professor Thompson's Articles—A Rejoinder



THE articles by Professor Thompson have undoubtedly elicited a widespread interest, and readers of *The Homiletic Review* have probably read them with different sensations. After studying them with close and repeated reading, the writer must say that he is frankly disappointed with the articles, as a whole. If they had appeared in a scientific or a secular journal, they would have been in their proper setting, and would have occasioned little comment or criticism. But to read articles like these in a religious and theological magazine, in days when the essence of the Christian revelation as recorded in the Bible is being assaulted on every side, is a different matter.

I put it to you honestly. What sort of a place in nature has a man, the "homo sapiens" of millions of years ago or today, according to the reasoning of Professor John Arthur Thompson, of Aberdeen, and the six Yale Professors? As a mutation or a saltatory variant from a stock common to the anthropoid apes, and the latest of a succession of evolutionary masterpieces, with an unknown and unknowable quantity of inherited anachronisms—or, to put it upon what Professor Thompson considers a little higher view, the theory of emergent evolution, the crown of emergent evolutions—what is man after all? For the everlasting and insistent question is not only where he came from and how he came, but whether we are to accept, with a tremendous crowd of magna vox scientists today, the Topsy view of creation, or that of the Bible? When poor little black Topsy was asked by Miss Ophelia, "Do you know who made you?" she answered, "Nobody, as I knows on, I s'pect I grow'd. Don't think nobody never made me," putting into fairly accurate and most descriptive language the latest, up-to-date, twentieth century view of a large number of the scientific leaders of today, who have not advanced one iota beyond the ignorance of the little darkie Topsy.

It is true that in an almost apologetic way, in fact, it is altogether too apologetic, the word "God" appears in his articles. He quotes Professor Lloyd Morgan as saying that "it is not inconsistent with his evolutionary

science to acknowledge God as the immaterial source of all change and the *nisus* through whose activities emergents emerge and the whole course of emergent evolution is directed." That's all very well. But there he stops. And then he practically says to any critics who venture to differ: "Hands off! Don't touch us. Religion is religion. Science is science. We admit that the highest religious concept is God, the creative source of all evolution; the directive Activity on whom the manner of going in all natural events ultimately depends; that He is the *nisus* directive of the course of events, that is, the Divine Spirit which animates all." But he calmly adds: "Science has nothing to say to this concept." And then he goes on to give what is called the last word in science from "The Antiquity of Man" by Arthur Keith, according to which man is a natural mutation or transilient variation from a Simian or primate stock. But, surely, what should be made clearer is that, according to the Bible, man was made. He was formed. He was a creation. He was made a little lower than the angels, not a little higher than the monkeys. He was and is crowned with glory and honor, by being made in the image of God and redeemed by God's Own Son for a final conformity with His glory.

In fact, we have no hesitation in saying that the whole of Professor Thompson's reasoning throughout these articles is contrary to the Bible and contrary to science. He says that they are not contrary to the Bible. He says that the two run on parallel lines like two railway tracks that do not touch one another. But that looks to me an evasion of the real issue. If the Bible were a vague book filled with a mixture of all sorts of myths, legends, traditions, lies, false cosmogonies, absurd and disconnected religious theories, a composite or cento of religious traditions, that would be a very reasonable line of argument. But the Bible is one. It's a unit from beginning to end. It doesn't merely talk vaguely of a God. It begins with the same God that it ends with, the one living and true God, the maker of heaven and earth, the Lord God Almighty, who, in Genesis 1:1, is the Commencement, and, in Revelation 22, the Consummation, of the Divine scheme of Creation and Redemption and the New Creation. It's a history of the creation of man and the race from its beginning, through its fall, and preparations for redemption, and then the coming of the Redeemer, and the redemption of mankind with the glory that is to follow, with

the manifestation of the sons of God. The centre of it all is man as a created being who fell, and needed redemption, and the Creator who sent His Son to redeem him.

I put it to you frankly: Is there any place in these three articles of Professor Thompson for the Bible scheme of creation, revelation, and redemption, with the Incarnate Son of God as its centre and consummation? You say: "Perhaps not. But then he is not writing about theology or from the theological viewpoint. He is a scientist. He is talking about science." That's just the point. For I have no hesitation whatever in saying that these articles do not represent the conclusions of science. Nor are they, in any true sense of the word, scientific. From beginning to end, they are simply a series of unproved and unprovable assumptions. They are just the *surmises* of science, a great big bundle of probabilities and guessings, all of which are assumed and none of them scientifically established. Yet they are handed out with an *ex cathedra* tone of finality that is whimsical to the rational mind. For when Professor Thompson talks of science as having to do with what can be either measured or precisely registered, he gives a definition that smashes hopelessly every one of his own assumptions. When one man talks about a hundred million, and another man talks about two millions, and a third man talks of a million years, he is *not* talking of things and figures that can be either measured or precisely registered. He is simply showing how absolutely loose and unreliable in his statements a man may be who stands, nevertheless, in the front rank of a special science. When he says species are not fixed, but evolving, he is simply talking about a theory; for a very strong section of the scientific world say that species are fixed and immutable. When Arthur Keith tries to construct his Piltdown man, much more to give dates for him, he leaves the domain of science and rushes, where angels would fear to tread, into the domain of conjecture and unscientific guessing. And when Huxley and Davidson and Thompson and Keith lay down, as an assured result of science, that because an ascending scale of animal life is found, that therefore the higher *must* have been evolved from the lower, they are simply piling hypothesis upon hypothesis. Even if they found a thousand more intermediate links, it would not *prove* that the later members came out of the earlier by a process of evolution. Scientists would still remain "immensely ignorant as to the factors leading to the emergence of

the human type"—(the most hopeful expression, by the way, in his three articles).

But the concluding point is this: If so-called scientists like to delve in the playground of assumption and conjecture, let them do so. But let them come off the roof of their high tone of dogmatism. It's too soon altogether to talk about assured results, and for them to assume so lofty an attitude of superiority towards those who will not accept the conclusions and the methods of their so-called scientific explorations. Let them not take up their position with their back to the sun, and ask us to accept conclusions that are not scientific and therefore cannot be true. Let them listen to one of their own greatest, Professor Virchow, and be wise: "When people see a doctrine which has been exhibited to them as certain, established, positive, and claiming universal acceptance, *proved to be faulty* in its essentials and chief tendencies, many lose faith in science."

As a matter of fact, believers in the Bible are in danger of being outclassed and overwhelmed by a body of men whose cool assumptions and loud assertions are not matters of proof or argument or assured result, but are simply the creed and cry of the Red wing in the ranks of science. And here is where I think a large number of Christian preachers and teachers are making the mistake of their lives.

"It's always best on these occasions," said Mr. Pickwick, "to do what the mob do."

"But suppose there are two mobs," suggested Mr. Snodgrass.

"Shout with the largest," replied Mr. Pickwick, and volumes could not have said more.

In the scientific world today, the majority of evolutionists are confessedly materialistic, and every thinking man must surely know that between the Christian believer and preacher today, and the materialistic evolutionist, there is a great gulf fixed. It is an untraversable chasm, and the Theistic evolutionist, no matter how earnestly he may long to be abreast of modern thought, cannot and dare not shake hands across it with Huxley and with Haeckel. No materialistic evolutionist can accept a creative act, nor will he even go so far as Professor Lloyd Morgan in tolerating the vague possibility of God as the immaterial source of change. Evolution, with them, has become a superstition, a superstition to be fought for at all costs, and desperately upheld, even at the price of dogmatic nescience.

The time has come to call a halt. The di-

vision must come sooner or later, and now is the time for the Christian world to stand on one side and say: I believe in God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth. I believe in the Bible as the Word of God. I believe in Jesus as our Lord and Saviour, the Lamb of God, the Son of God, and that all things were made by Him; and without Him was not any thing made that was made. (John 1: 1-3; Col. 1: 15-17.)

After reading with great patience, and with every desire to be sympathetic, the very able articles of Professor Thompson, I believe with all my heart that no Christian minister on this continent, the Unitarians excepted, can dally with the rationalisms of so-called scientific evolution without attempting the impossible. That is, the impossible of constructing a system of Christian theology combining divine revelation and the Bible of Genesis, John, Romans, and Revelation, with a system of so-called scientific, philosophic thought that practically disintegrates it. Standing upon the Eternal Rock of the Word, Revealed and Incarnate, the Christian knows that God is the Lord God Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth; that God created man in His own image; that Christ who is the Image of the Invisible God, died for his sins, rose again for his justification, reigns now at the right hand of the Majesty on High, to return in His glorious Epiphany for the manifestation of the Son of God.

Believing this, therefore, we are sure that it does not become any Christian, still less any Christian leader, any more than a scientific leader, to give up a principle because of difficulties. The Christian ministers of today need more moral fortitude, or, rather, more spiritual fortitude, for the most serious symptom of present-day ministerial life is the indifference of so many ministers to the things that are at stake in present-day controversies. If Athanasius cried: "We are fighting for our all," believers in the Bible today are also fighting for their all. The acceptance of the premises and suppositions and principles of evolution, as commonly accepted by scientists, atheistic or theistic, would simply wreck the Old Testament and leave us with but a shadow of Christ. Read Isa. 40-46. Read Jer. 10: 1-16. Read John 1: 1-16, and Acts 17: 22-31, with its sublime message to the college men and women of today. Above all, read Col. 1: 15-19 and 2: 3-10, and the glorious revelation of Rom. 8: 19-30, and I Cor. 15: 39-57, and cry in your heart and soul: "Here I stand. This is rock, solid Rock. All other ground is sinking sand."

The Evolutionist at the Bar

By the Rev. Edwin Irving Niles, Rochester, New Hampshire

THE time has come when the Evolutionist should be summoned to the Bar of public opinion, and that his moral character should be made the object of a rigid investigation. There can be no question but that the Evolutionary Hypothesis has had a most damaging effect upon Christianity, upon the greatest moral force known to man. "Its legitimate tendency is to degrade mankind from that mental and moral dignity that is always recognized as belonging to them, and to place them on an essential level with the brute creation." (J. B. Warren, of the University of California.) It not only overthrows all the essential doctrines of Christianity, but it makes sin to be—not the transgression of God's law—but simply the left-over animalism of bygone ages, which man is not responsible for, and which he is gradually outgrowing.

To propagate a mere theory in the name of science, which does away with human responsibility, and lowers the standard of morals, must brand the man who does it as being himself sadly deficient in his moral make-up. It would seem bad enough to urge the acceptance of any views, fraught with such dire results, even though they were based upon the most incontrovertible facts, but to propagate a destructive theory in the name of science, built upon immense assumptions, is to place the one who does it in a list with those, who for some selfish interest, will lure a multitude into the ways of death.

Some Primary Assumptions

The theory of evolution—as does the nebular hypothesis of LaPlace—assumes the existence of matter, of force, of life, and of law; and then assumes that the theory is just as valid as it would be, if it were definitely known that matter, force, life, and law all came into being by the processes of evolution. It is hardly necessary to say that men of unquestioned veracity do not make such assumptions.

The Origin of Things

Instead of boldly assuming the origin of things, let us imagine a time in the distant past when there was a forceless, lifeless, thoughtless, universal nothingness; a time in which nothing did exist. But if there ever

was such a time, then nothing ever could exist; for it is not possible to get something out of nothing, and neither is it possible to get out of a thing that which it does not contain. There was just as much in this Universe before any ball of fire was swung out into the trackless immensities of space, as there is now, because God was there.

I am well aware of the objection of Kant, to the Cosmological argument in favor of the existence of God. Kant asserted that it was cumbered with the assumption that there could be no infinite series of contingent or finite causes. But the objection is puerile, for it is self-evident that there could be no such thing as an infinite series of finite causes. The very proposition involves a contradiction of terms, for in any series of finite causes each one of the series must have a beginning and an end. And if each one has a beginning, then it is evident that there was a time before any of them began to be. In order therefore, that there should be any extended series of finite causes there must first be a cause without a beginning, and that cause we call the Creator.

We are told that the atoms of which all matter is composed are in a state of constant motion, and that in fact, the atom itself is a whole system of gyrating worlds. But every motion or revolution has had a beginning, and so there was a time before any of them began to be, a time when He who had no beginning caused them to be.

Orbital Movements

If matter had a beginning, then it is evident that each globe composed of matter had a beginning, and that there was therefore, a time before any of them began to move in their orbits, in obedience to the guiding hand of some adequate force.

But now we are confronted with the question: What impelling force started sun, planets, and satellites forward in their age-long periodical circuits. It was once supposed that each of these bodies moved from west to east, and that if all moved in the same direction, their movements could be accounted for by some natural forces. But it is now known that "the ninth satellite of Saturn, the eighth of Jupiter, and the one of Neptune are retrograde, or revolve in the opposite direction. The satellites of Uranus revolve in orbits

which are practically at right angles to the orbit of the planet." (George McCready Price.) No natural force can account for these retrograde movements, and the only explanation of the phenomena is, that an Infinite Being—and not some law of necessity—gave an impelling force to some satellites in an opposite direction from that of the general order.

No one dare claim that all atoms came from some one first atom, or that all the solar or celestial bodies came from some first globe, for it is certain that there has been no evolution—in the sense that one thing is derived from another—in all this major part of the Universe. And the Evolutionist must content himself by closing his eyes to the facts, and then making the ungodly assumption that somehow evolution is the process by which all things have come into being.

Variation and Evolution

Evolution is well defined as a "continuous progressive change according to certain laws and by means of resident forces" (Prof. J. Le Coute). Theistic evolution is a mere makeshift, because if it be admitted that each organic and inorganic form is fashioned by a personal Creator, then it is manifestly absurd to talk about "acquired characters," "the transmission of variations," "inherited peculiarities," etc.

The underlying assumption of evolution is that changes come "according to certain laws, and by resident forces." But force is non-intelligent, and hence it must work according to some law of necessity; it must work without variation, unless deviated from its course by some other force.

There are, however, a multitude of variations which cannot be accounted for in this way. One eye often varies from the other, and so does one side of the mouth and teeth vary from the others. The creases in the palm of one hand and the veins—as may be seen—on the back of one hand and arm vary from those on the other side. The color of one leg or one side of many animals vary from that of the other side. Yet with all of these variations—which prove that the building force is not governed by necessity,—one arm or one leg does not vary appreciably from the other in length. In arms and legs measurements are so exact that no one discovers any difference. But why not vary here the same as in a multitude of other cases? Evidently because the building force is an intelligent force. Then, too, amidst unnumbered variations of

body and mind there is seldom an idiot or a monstrosity. These facts indicate three laws involving intelligence and beneficence.

(1) That existence shall be given a fair chance of locomotion and labor.

(2) That it shall be given an intelligent guide.

(3) That it shall not be burdened with monstrosities.

The Cell and Maturity

It is well known that all organic forms are built up by microscopic living structures, called cells. All the higher forms of life begin their existence in one cell, which cell came from the union of two cells. In the first stages of development, this original cell divides, making two cells, which process of division goes on until there are four, eight, sixteen, thirty-two, sixty-four, etc. After a time these cells begin to differentiate, some divisions of them begin the building of blood vessels, others the nerves, muscles, bones, eyes, ears, heart, lungs, etc.

Much is said about heredity and the transmission of variations, etc.; but such expressions involve the idea that the whole plan of the offspring, including its minutest details, is transmitted by parents to that first cell, and from it to multiplied millions of other cells. It involves the idea that that first cell, with its resident forces, plus a quantity of lifeless matter, is equal to the matured offspring; be it bird or man, with all of its parts, and all of its organs, with their functions, and with its wonderful instincts, or mental powers. In this problem matter plays a negligible part, for it may constitute the form of a fool or of a Newton. Then, too, the cell is non-intelligent. It cannot originate or initiate a single act, it has no power of will or of self-determination. It simply follows the law of necessity. But if its acts are necessitated,—and not free, nor yet by chance—then back of them there must be a necessitating force, and that force must be intelligent, and equal to the task of forming each part, and each organ, with their functions, and then crowning it all with a marvelous instinct or intelligence.

But against all of this the Evolutionist assumes that out of an infinitesimal point of living matter, plus a quantity of lifeless matter, there may come a Newton, a Lock, or a Gladstone. It is the assumption of the mental prostitute that you can get something out of nothing; the logical conclusion of which may well lead to such an affirmation as this:

As much knowledge can be derived from a wilderness as from a University.

The Derivation of an Organ

In one of William Jennings Bryan's public addresses he quotes Dr. Fosdick as saying, "If a man has eyes the biologists tell us that it was because the light rays beat on the skin and the eyes came out; that if he has ears, the sound waves were there first and the ears came out to hear!" And that "evolutionists tell us a man hasn't a power that doesn't come out in response to environment."

A person would be very simple indeed, if he did not ask in response to such a statement: Why eyes and ears did not come out at random all over the body. The statement betrays a mental prostitution which makes it more worthy of contempt than of a reply. But as Evolutionists will have it that an organ is the product of development, it may be proper to ask what the poor animals did during the long ages in which they were developing a stomach, a heart, the lungs, etc. And it may be well to ask how the udder was developed, and why, if the young could live without it, they ever attempted to draw nourishment from the mother, and why when it did them no good they should for unnumbered generations have continued going to the same identical place for nourishment.

Another question is, how, for ages, living things were brought into existence, before males and females were developed? Without the two sexes there could be no offspring, and without the offspring there could be no development. It is evident, then, that living things came into existence by creation and not by development.

The Antiquity of Man

Everything possible is being done to undermine our confidence in the Bible, by making it appear that man has been upon earth for an indefinitely long period of time.

There are, however, a multitude of facts which prove that geology can give us no reliable information in regard to this matter. There is no regular order in which the stratified beds of rocks were laid down. "Any kind of fossiliferous beds whatever, 'young' or 'old,' may be found occurring conformably on any other fossiliferous bed, 'older' or 'younger.'" "We now know that no one type of fossil can be proved to be older than another." (Price.)

The age we live in is vastly different from the one in which these fossiliferous beds were

formed, for nothing like the perfect forms and immense quantities of those fossils, often covering thousands of square miles, are being preserved today.

It is also a fact that an astounding change of climate took place some time in the past. A vegetation grew in the Arctic regions long years ago, sufficient to form great beds of coal. One day elephants were feeding there, when the terrific change came and they were frozen to death, and have remained frozen till now, some with undigested food in their stomachs; and are so well preserved that scientists have eaten their flesh.

In the La Brea beds of California elephants, camels, tigers, huge sloths, and horses were once piled on one another rods deep. "In practically every corner of the world" the same thing happened, and they were buried by deposits laid down by moving bodies of water. These are some of the irregular and sudden geological changes.

And where forces have worked varying in intensity from a mist of rain to a catastrophic flood, no one can tell the time involved in the burial of the bones of some unknown man. One might as well try to tell how long it took for a certain quantity of snow to fall, where he was not a witness to the storms. It is certain, therefore, that the age assigned by Evolutionists to the bones of unknown men, is nothing but an arrogant assumption.

The theory of evolution as based upon similarity of forms is supported by no evidence, unless someone can prove what is incapable of proof, namely, that similarity of forms could come only by evolution.

The least, then, that can be said of those who have built on these ungodly assumptions is that they are not trustworthy men.

* * *

The claim is being made today that "The pulpit has lost its power." This may be true in many cases, but it is only true where the evangelical and evangelistic preacher of the gospel of the blessed son of God ringing out in tones of authority against sin, when souls were shaken with the sense of their guilt before God and turned to a Saviour for redemption, has given place to the popular lecturer and pulpit entertainer.—*Western Recorder*.

* * *

The more faithfully I apply myself to the duties of the Lord's day, the more happy and successful is my business during the week.—*Sir Matthew Hale*.

The World

An Inductive Exegesis and an Exposition

By William H. Bates, D.D., Greeley, Colorado

Introductory

HE author, very early in his ministry, found himself very much perplexed as to the WORLD. How to deal with the word exegetically, used as it is in the Scriptures, now with one meaning, now with another; and, still more, how to deal with the thing itself practically,—these were embarrassing questions. He read, on the one hand, that "He hath made everything beautiful in his time" (Eccl. 3:11), and that we are to "Use this world as not abusing it" (1 Cor. 7:31); and, on the other hand, that "A friend of the world is the enemy of God" (James 4:4), and that "If any man love the world, the love of the father is not in him" (1 John 2:15). Which is which? What is it that distinguishes between the good and the bad, between the permitted and the prohibited, in that which constitutes the World? And how can we rightly deal with the World practically, if we do not know aright what it is theoretically? Knowledge must precede practice.

He told his perplexity to a beloved Theological Professor at whose feet it had been his delight to sit, and asked that teacher if he would not make—since he was pre-eminently qualified so to do, as was evidenced by the fact that he had with signal success filled both Hebrew and Greek professorships—a complete exegesis of the term "World" throughout the Bible; discriminating with precision between the allowed and the disallowed in it, and give to the public the result; for surely, in the lack of such a study, there was great need that this work should be done, not only for enlightenment in Christian thought, but for universal helpfulness in Christian life. The Professor turned upon the Pupil, and said, "Do it yourself." Dutifulness and duty combined to lay upon the latter a necessity which he has sought to meet. With what result, herewith appears in eight articles, the first of which immediately follows.

Biblical World-Terms

The Old Testament

A satisfactory answer to the question, What is the World? can be found only in a study

of all the passages in the Bible where the word occurs; and the answer, to be satisfactory, must include all the contents of the term, and an explicit exposition of them.

The one English word "World" translates five different Hebrew words in the Old Testament, and five different Greek words in the New Testament. These may be presented, it is hoped, so that the ordinary reader, uninstructed in the original languages of Scripture, can thoroughly understand them.

1. The first word in the Old Testament is *erets*. It occurs 2,454 times. In the Authorized Version, it is translated 1,512 times, *land*; 695 times, *earth*, as in Gen. 1:1, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth"; 139 times, *country*; 97 times, *ground*; 3 times, *way*; *nation*, *field*, *common*, and *wilderness*, once each; and 4 times, *world*, as in Ps. 22:27, "All the ends of the world shall remember," etc. See also Isa. 23:17; 62:11; and Jer. 25:26. This is the world, or earth, simply in its physical aspect. In Gen. 1:10, God pronounces it "good."

2. The second is *chedel*. It occurs but once, Isa. 38:11,—"I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world." Gesenius defines it, "place of rest, region of the dead, hades." Young's Concordance gives it the meaning of *cessation*. While the Revision translates this text as the Authorized Version does, it gives the phrase, "with the inhabitants of the world," this marginal equivalent: "among them that have ceased to be."

3. The third is *cheled*. It is used five times, and is twice translated, *age*; twice, *world*; and once, *short time*. The idea of it is *duration*, but with special reference to brevity, or transitoriness, as in Ps. 39:5,—"Mine age (*cheled*) is as nothing before Thee." The two places where it is translated *world*, are Ps. 17:14, "Men of the world," and Ps. 49:1, "Inhabitants of the world": the thought being that of "dwellers in this narrow sphere of mortality" (Spurgeon's Treasury of David, I, p. 248).

4. The fourth is *olam*. It occurs 412 times. It is translated 235 times, *forever*; 65 times, *everlasting*; 22 times, *perpetual*. The list is here left incomplete, as the word is translated by 23 different expressions. They all, how-

ever, have time significance,—indefinite time. Only twice is it rendered *world*. First, in Ps. 73:12,—“Behold, these are the ungodly that prosper in *the world*.” The Revisers punctuate the verse differently, and render *olam* by the phrase, “always at ease.” Hengstenberg translates it, “eternally secure.” The other place is Eccl. 3:11,—“He hath made everything beautiful in his time; also he hath set *the world* in their heart.” Better: “Eternity in the heart,” for *olam* is a time word. This is a rendering of Zockler, and of the Revisers, in the margin. Maclarens says that this word, in the Old Testament, “has never but one meaning, and that meaning is *eternity*.” “Eternity in the heart,” i.e. a conception of endless duration, intuition of infinity, thought and desire of immortality.

5. The last is *tebel*. It is used 36 times, and is rendered 35 times, *world*; and once *habitable part*. It primarily denotes “the

habitable earth,” as in Ps. 33:8,—“Let all the inhabitants of *the world* (*tebel*, i.e. the habitable earth) stand in awe of Him.” Then it has, by metonymy, a secondary meaning, denoting the inhabitants themselves, as in Ps. 9:8,—“He shall judge *the world* (*tebel*, i.e. the inhabitants of the world) in righteousness.”

The foregoing will probably be considered a sufficiently comprehensive, and yet detailed, view of the meaning of the Old-Testament world-terms. With this showing, doubtless all will accept the statement of that distinguished scholar, Taylor Lewis, that “The New Testament use of the word *world* for ‘worldliness,’ ‘love of the world,’ is unknown to the Hebrew Scriptures” (Lange’s *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, p. 67).

NOTE—This is the first of a series of eight articles on “The World,” by Dr. Bates. The second will appear in the June issue.

The New Geology.

By Joseph D. Wilson, D.D., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

HE story of Creation is given in the first chapter of Genesis. The creation was in six “days”—evidently six periods of time. On the sixth day began the history of man. It began in innocence but it did not continue in innocence, for Satan came in and fair Eden was gone. The story as told in Genesis is brief, and after sin entered the Garden our first parents were expelled, human history is a tragedy; jealousy and anger and murder are there and unhappily have marked the race ever since.

Our scholars are curious about those early days and have sought diligently for any testimony bearing upon that time. They have sought it in the rocks, and have indeed found some evidence, but the interpretation of that evidence is difficult; there is liability to mistake. Entering upon that task, the searcher must divest himself of preconceived opinions, must be ready to change his theories and follow meekly whither the rocks shall show the way. Naturally enough the search started from the knowledge of Nature’s methods as we see them now. Nature’s methods are deliberate; there is no haste! Nature builds a continent or rears a mountain; it carves out lofty pinnacles; it spreads out miles of coal measures, and carves out courses of rivers, but it does not do these things in a day. It

requires time for its work and it takes the time. There are deposits of coal which were made of branches of trees, of twigs and of leaves; millions of leaves and thousands upon thousands of twigs and branches are necessary for a single foot of coal.

But how could these multitudinous elements,—leaves, twigs, or whatever they are—be brought together to form the vast seams of coal, or how could grains of sand be heaped together to form a mountain, or what carved a water-course in the solid rock? It takes years for autumn leaves to make an inch of soil; the wind scatters the sand or elements which make the mountain; the growing things die in autumn and are blown away in the breeze.

But wait a bit. Nature sometimes works rapidly and makes vast changes speedily. Scholars tell us that once this earth rejoiced in a spring-like climate everywhere except in the extreme polar regions; there was not the bitter cold of winter in what we call the temperate zone nor the deadly heat of summer in the tropics. It seems to have been a perpetual spring. No one who lived in those halcyon days has written about it, so that our only means of information is in the physical conditions which we find. There are vast coal deposits in Alaska and in British

Columbia that testify to a long-continued genial climate.

But besides these evidences of a genial climate all over the globe there are animal remains. Elephants, rhinoceroses, oxen and other animals suited to a genial climate have been found in Siberia with their flesh untainted, preserved for many years by being frozen. Among these, the Mammoth, the ancient elephant, has been so abundant that a lively trade has been carried on for many years in the ivory of their tusks. Some time ago under the Czarist regime a mammoth was exhumed and the dogs eagerly ate the flesh; the skeleton was removed to St. Petersburg and no doubt is there today if the Soviets have not destroyed it.

These discoveries point to an Eden all over the world. What caused these conditions, or rather, what caused the change from these condition? This is a problem for scientists! The "New Geology" suggests an explanation, not, however, as a finality. It is that some force changed the earth's axis of revolution from the perpendicular to its present inclination of twenty-three and a half degrees. This theory (it is only a theory) would insure the same season in the same place on the earth's surface, but whether it would restore the lost Eden may be questioned. The full solution of the astronomical problem must await further development, but it goes far to explain the phenomena as we find them now in the stratified rocks.

Geology has proceeded hitherto upon the supposition that the earth has grown upon a uniform plan, *i.e.* that all things have operated in the same way through all the ages—that mighty changes have occurred, but that these changes have not been made by sudden and mighty forces but by slow and gentle changes, protracted through enormous time; "given time enough and the mightiest changes are possible."

In estimating the succession of the strata it has been assumed that the rocks containing "primitive" animals were the first laid down, and that the fossils found therein were the earliest; and so a supposed historical succession has been devised, and we have the Archaean, the Cambrian, the Silurian, the Devonian, the Carboniferous, etc.," rising from the Azoic, which contains no vestige of life, to those which contain signs of life, until we reach the "modern" forms. But this arrangement proved unsatisfactory, for some of the "older" forms of life kept appearing in the modern strata and some of the "modern" forms in the older strata.

The adjusting of the various forms of life to the "age" in which they were supposed to have existed has occasioned much controversy. The "New Geology" disregards these ancient terms which supposed a vast amount of time, and supposes a great catastrophe.

This catastrophe is recorded in the Scriptures. It was the Flood. The human beings upon the earth were destroyed, the land animals suffered similarly. Mighty waves rolled round and round the world; whole races of animals and men were destroyed. Man had become corrupt and God said, "I will destroy the people on the earth." Or, as St. Peter tells it in his second epistle, "the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished."

The geological series on which we who are now mature in years were brought up, have no scientific time-values. The discoveries now being made have thrown the supposed "order of creation" into disorder. Many genera supposed to be extinct and found only in the Paleozoic or Mesozoic rocks have been found in other associations in modern times. The confident announcements of fossils, millions and millions of years old, of which we read now and then in the newspapers, have no scientific basis. The "New Geology" has started the learned world upon theories which agree more and more with Scripture.

Many of us had adopted the conclusion that the Biblical flood was a local affair. The universal tradition thereof among primitive peoples could hardly be disregarded, but we argued that traditions are not proofs and where was the water to come from? and so forth. So we settled on a local subsidence in a limited area.

The "New Geology" has opened the way to wider evidence and probably to wiser conclusions. It is written by Prof. George McCready Price, of Union College, College View, Nebr., and published by the Pacific Press, Mountain View, Calif. It is a book of over seven hundred pages with over 600 illustrations. The price is \$3.50.

Few clergymen have money enough to spend so much upon subjects however interesting. I suggest, therefore, that small clubs of ministers might be formed to buy this book and thus come abreast of the most recent knowledge which science has to give us. The book can be procured in this region from the Tract Society, Germantown Ave., Philadelphia, and, of course, from the publishers. I have two copies but I keep them in the seminary with which I am connected for the use of my students.

Religion in Reach

By Lawrence Keister, D.D., Scottdale, Pennsylvania

Paul and the Ascended Christ

IT WAS the risen and ascended Jesus who changed Paul from Jew to Christian and called him to be an apostle. Both ends were secured at the same time and by the same means.

Paul's question, Who art thou, Lord? brought forth the unexpected answer, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." Memorable meeting! In after years Paul asked in self-defense, "Am I not an apostle, Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" This condition of apostleship had been met. This personal interview led to a complete personal understanding. He was in no way behind the chief apostles for he was called and commissioned by the ascended Christ.

How rapidly Paul learned in that wonderful, wayside interview. There and then he laid aside his savage opposition, his relentless skepticism, his boastful Phariseeism. He learned to love instead of hate. He became Christian in spirit and conduct and not in name only. He changed his allegiance quickly and completely. Authority obtained in Jerusalem shriveled in his hands as a superior Sovereignty won his heart. In answer to the ascended Christ he speaks in terms and tones that reflect his transformation: "What shall I do, Lord?"

According to Dr. Orr, "It is not Christ's earthly life but his risen life which is the principle of quickening in the Church." The former is historically fixed, but the latter belongs to history now in process. It is ever-present and ever operative in the realm of religious life. It enters our experience as well as Paul's, not in the same miraculous way, but with the same appeal and the same effect. Only a living leader can inspire men and command them.

Let us not esteem it strange that Jesus showed himself, after his resurrection, to his disciples and convinced them that he was living and related to them as before. It was not a master stroke of diplomacy but a fulfillment of promise, an affirmation of principle. Paul knew Christ as living and expressed this fact in terms of his own personal experience. "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." Christ is greater than Paul in his own life. This subordinate position is Paul's pleasure, his glory. He regards this relation to Christ

the common privilege of Christians who are directed to seek the things that are above because they have been raised together with Christ.

The origin of Christian life is no mystery. Paul knew whence it came and Dr. Orr knew and any man can know. In its own field science renders great service to mankind, but it does not give us the religion of the New Testament nor can it add to its potency. Science discovers power as this is stored in nature, but the risen Christ is beyond the range of its investigation. The Christian is primarily spiritual and belongs to the super-scientific realm which we call the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven.

If the Christian is heavenly in temper and spirit he is also heroic in choice and testimony. He suffers loss, perhaps the loss of all things. He may be called to stand for the truth with the odds against him. Paul gathers the experience of thirty-four years into a single sentence, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but also to all them that have loved his appearing." Three points stand out, the day of his conversion, the end of his earthly career and "that day"; two facts are stated, his present faithfulness and his future reward; and all of these belong in any spiritual biography.

But are Christians heroic today? Do they fight the good fight or do they fall before popular errors? Do they finish the course or do they become so liberal that they question its existence? Do they keep the faith once delivered to the saints or do they revise it to suit the tendencies of the times? Are they conscious of their own faithfulness and confident of their own future reward?

Let Christian people face the issue and honestly and heroically take their places beside the apostle Paul. Only the risen Christ can nerve men for conflict in presence of organized evil. Only the living Christ can inspire men to think with Pauline independence and act with Pauline courage. The Christ of the gospels is ours but he it was who said "follow me", in my teaching, my example, my victory over evil, and my resurrection life. You require a Savior who lives, who is your con-

temporary, who can offer you aid, who can lead you on to victory.

Only the living Christ can change worldlings into Christians. Spiritual effects have spiritual causes. Strong, sturdy Christians have no mental reservations and misgivings. Paul never backslid. His religion never grew limp and lifeless. He never felt the need of resorting to evolution for new thoughts and the latest novel for new forms of expression. His gospel was good news to the end and his spirit fresh and vital.

Wavering Christians discredit the gospel, the Christ, the Holy Spirit. They shrink from the thought of God as our Father in heaven. They lose sight of the risen Christ who was as real to Paul as Paul was to himself. The marks of the Lord Jesus were upon his body and his spirit was in his soul. Life answered to life. God is real and any man's relation to God may be the most real thing he knows.

Like God, love and righteousness are real. Both belong to the spiritual kingdom in which God reigns and in which men ought to dwell. Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three. Why think of material things as the abiding things? Heaven and earth shall pass away, says Jesus, but my words shall not pass away. They are like himself, living and durable. No Christian of the Pauline type can be cheated

out of the realities of life and robbed of his religion.

How men admire the wisdom of the great Teacher and the power of the mighty Worker of miracles; how they dwell upon his crystal character and his sinless life; how they eulogize One who came to minister and to offer his life a ransom for others; but how quickly their ardor chills when they are invited to follow Christ beyond the cross and the empty tomb into his resurrection life! O that we might hear men expressing the desire earnestly, longingly, "that I may know him and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his suffering." Or claiming as their own the religious experience and the spiritual standing of all true Christians, "whose life is hid with Christ in God."

Our Christ comes not as a menial, not as a sinner's substitute. He comes to minister, to quiet the accusing conscience but he comes also to offer us a gospel that is not limited by our horizon. He comes to co-operate with us each and all in working out our own salvation with fear and trembling. He comes in the interest of immortals. "God is not the God of the dead but of the living" and so the living Christ is the Christ of living Christians, whom Christians are called upon to love and obey and from whom they must receive the impulse and energy that characterizes them as Christians.

Liberalism and Piety

By the Reverend John A. Hoffman, Nezperce, Idaho

HE liberal school attracts attention because of its so-called newness—"New Theology." Things that are new invariably attract attention. They suggest human progress, which is the slogan of the day. Therefore the words "progress" and "reactionary" stand out in bold relief in present-day thought. Accordingly, theologians are divided into two opposing groups. The one is known under the term of "fundamentalist," while the other group styles itself "liberal." What are the main issues on which these groups are divided?

The fundamentalist believes, first of all, in the divine inspiration of all the canonical books of the Bible. While disclaiming any theory as to the mode of inspiration, he postulates that the biblical writers were inspired in a manner peculiar to themselves. He declares that these writers "speak as the Spirit gave

them utterance." And he believes this to be true because "man by wisdom could not find God." The training and the environment of the biblical writers were not conducive to such profound insight into divine truth as is made manifest in the Bible.

If man by wisdom could find God, the Greek school of philosophers should have been first in giving to the world the true conception of God. They had training and environment on their side. But the simple facts in the case are that the wise men of Greece received no such revelation. The knowledge that the wisest men of the ages did not receive was given to the peasants of obscure Judea.

The first and foremost postulate of the Liberal is to deny that "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." The biblical writers, so far from being divinely inspired, functioned merely as redacteurs, who revised and annotated previous writings, add-

ing to these their own religious experience.

Miracles are rejected on the ground that they are contrary to human reason. Things that are recorded as miracles were merely miraculous events in the minds of the ignorant peasants of Judea. Had they been less superstitious, and had they been as intelligent as we are today, the Jews would not have been so credulous as to believe in supernatural events! Ergo, there was no virgin birth and no resurrection. The attempt of some liberals to refute the virgin birth, and yet accept the resurrection, is to divide a house against itself.

No system of theological interpretation has been so vain in its own conceits as is liberalism. The liberal never ceases to mount the house-tops and proclaim to all the world the fact of his mental superiority. He is very loud in his declaration that his theology is something brand new under the sun, based on recent discoveries. But, strange as it may seem, he invariably fails to produce the evidence that logic requires of him. Like the evolutionist, he is strong on assertion, but weak on facts. He merely assumes something, as Astruc did when he propagated the Jehovahistic-Elohistic theory. And, having assumed something, he expects the rest of mankind to change its creed to conform with his assumption. All this talk about new light is designed to deceive the unwary.

What does church history have to say on the newness of liberalism? In the first century the Gnostics occupied the same ground that is now taken by the liberals. We quote from *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*:

"Gnosticism was the rationalism of the ancient church. It was an effort of profound speculative thought to harmonize the Christian revelation with reason. It brought forth the distinguished principles of Hellenic philosophy, Oriental philosophy, and the Jewish religion, and compared the great ideas of Christianity with them. . . . The Gnostics subordinated the will to knowledge, and represented experimental Christianity as knowledge rather than faith, and made knowledge the standard of the moral condition. They would have changed Christ's words in Matt. 5:8 to the statement: 'They that see God are pure in heart.' They were influenced by the aristocratic class-feeling of the Greek philosopher, who regarded himself as lifted above the religious creed and humiliating occupation of the multitude." (See article on Gnosticism.)

The new theology is as new as is the Gnosticism of the first century! Yet the liberalist has the hardihood to lay great stress on the newness of his theology!

Porphyry lived in the third century. He was a man of powerful intellect and striking

personality. His method of attack on the Bible was to subject its contents to the scrutiny of his superior intellect. He wrote a book denying miracles. He attempted to show that the writers of the Bible were not divinely inspired. They simply related the story of their own religious experience! It was Porphyry's attitude toward the Bible that made him a pagan.

Gnosticism did not survive long. For fifteen hundred years it lay dormant. Jean Astruc, a French physician, revived it, but gave it a new name—Rationalism. In a book published in 1753, he invented the Jehovahistic-Elohistic document theory, asserting that there were traces of no less than ten different memoirs employed by Moses when he composed the Book of Genesis. This led him to deny the divine inspiration of the Bible.

Astruc's theory attracted little attention until fifty years later, when Eichhorn, a professor of theology, endorsed the Jehovahistic-Elohistic theory. Being a distinguished Oriental scholar, Eichhorn was influential in spreading the theory of Astruc throughout Europe. From Germany it was brought to England, where Professor Driver, professor of Hebrew at Oxford, capitulated to it. From England it came to America, where it was adopted by Professor Charles A. Briggs, of Union Theological Seminary.

So widely prevalent was liberalism a hundred years ago, that Tholuck, the great German theologian, says he was fifteen or sixteen years old before he met a man who believed in the divine inspiration of the Bible. The universities of Germany were filled with students and professors who were rationalists or infidels. In Berlin, which had 700 theological students, only twenty or thirty were known to be orthodox. Professor Hengstenberg, who had overcome rationalism by contact with the Moravians, said one day to his class of theological students that any god who is fashioned out of stone or out of the rational mind is a false god. The students responded by hissing and scraping their feet on the floor.

The net worth of any system of theology must be attested by its fruits. That is a logical test. By it, rationalism must stand or fall. Are the fruits of liberalism conducive to the upbuilding of the spiritual life? Does it make for deeper piety and more holy living?

The BIBLE CHAMPION, some years ago, sent out the following challenge: "We hold our pages open to record the work of any minister who accepts and preaches the New Theology and is a soul-saver." A few months

ago, the editor, in referring to that challenge, said: "We have been waiting now for more than six years for an answer to this challenge, but none has come. That word 'soul-saver' has proven a silencer."

Experience goes to show that many a pulpit has been sapped of its spiritual power because the preacher has embraced liberalism. It has, likewise, as observation shows, weakened the spiritual power of the pew. Some liberals acknowledge the loss of spiritual fervor. They propose to remedy this condition by preaching social service, but the social Gospel has failed to restore the lost spiritually; it has failed to bring in the young people, as it was supposed to do; it has driven many old saints out of the churches where it is being preached. The people demand the Bread of Life from the pulpit. Failing to get it, they will go elsewhere for spiritual nutrition.

Liberalism thus shows itself to be a step backward, not forward. Just now the emphasis is on a seven-day a week church. This, it is hoped, will bring people into the church. It may bring them into the basement, where

games are played, but it does not, therefore, bring them into the church service on Sunday morning.

Dr. Marcus Dods, a great English divine, lost himself in liberalism. A short time before his death, he wrote a brief confession, saying: "I now take no interest in prayer. I am down under the waters of doubt. I see no blue sky, no light."

Dr. George Adam Smith, another great English theologian, in a lecture, at Yale, among other things, said: "The conflict between traditionalism and scholarship is ended. Scholarship has won. All that remains is to fix the indemnity." Dr. Smith lost three sons in battle in the late war, while another came home seriously wounded. In an address before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America, he made this confession before that great throng of people: "I have come back to the faith of my covenanting father, to the Gospel of salvation by grace, to the God who died for me on Calvary's cross."

Keeping the Faith

By Christopher G. Hazard, D.D., Catskill, New York



T is said that, hard as it is to make money, it is harder to keep it. Riches have wings, as anyone may see who is able to find American eagles upon coins in his pocket. They fly away into airy and unfounded schemes: they attract speculators and follow their decoys. Men who might have remained wealthy are left poor.

So it is with faith: it is gained with difficulty but easily lost. Vigilance is the price of keeping it. It is founded upon truths that are always and everywhere cunningly and plausible assailed. It is confirmed by experience that is easily forgotten. There is a traitorous doubt in every breast that is ready to cloud mind and heart and deliver up the soul to its enemies. Peter, with the best purposes and ready to die for his Lord, is still ready to deny him, and will do so if he forgets to watch and pray.

So it is with the faith: that body of Christian truth that the soul has formed from the Scriptures, from the history of the Christian Church, from the traditions and teachings of home, from the associations, worship and teachings of the house of God: that creed and

guide of life that is in communion with the saints of the past, their writings and their hymns; that has been the source and the solace of communion with the mind of the Spirit of truth, a means of knowing Christ, a power to serve him: those slowly acquired ideas that have grown into blessed and useful history, interwoven in the very texture of character, may be sacrificed to new religious notions, superseded by gospels unworthy of the name, leaving the soul without chart or compass and on the way to shipwreck.

If proof of this is needed it is not far to seek. Our time is deafened by the cry of many voices. The confusion of Babel was order in comparison with the religious anarchy of today. That quiet and unquestioned settlement of Christian truth among the churches and in the communities which many can still remember has passed away. The common consent to the authority of the Bible, as revealing a way of salvation from the fact and penalty of sin and as offering a glorious immortality to faith, that prevailed in our country up to the middle of the last century, has disappeared from the popular mind. The worth and dignity of the Christian Church

and the authority of its ministers as interpreters and teachers of its message no longer impress our communities. Advertisements and publications innumerable set forth different and misleading religious philosophies and movements with high sounding promises of liberty and progress. And to these new standards and false Christs the people gather in multitudes. They are the religious fashion. Even from the Christian churches many come to them. Forgetting the faith of their fathers as an outgrown thing and laying aside their convictions as old-fashioned garments, they lose the faith that was delivered to them and become destitute of truth. Truth as it is in Jesus having become to them a hard saying, they walk no more with it.

But Paul, amid the controversial storms of his day, and notwithstanding the allurements of the gilded philosophies of his age, and de-

spite the fierce and hurtful oppositions of the enemies of truth, kept the faith. He said at the end of his glorious course, "I have kept the faith," having fought well against the deceptions and the powers of darkness he foresaw his crown of perfected life. He may have been poor else, but he was rich in faith.

And if he could speak to us again it would not be with new doctrines and different exhortations. From his summit of Christian experience he would still exhort us to guard well that precious and fruitful faith which he received from the Lord and delivered unto us, that proved heritage of the Christian ages, that sum of Christian truths that binds together the saints of the past and those of the present, and that will gather to its communion all the saints to come; that unity of faith which will fill the mind of all saints when the Christian Church is full grown.

Motherhood and Manhood

By Edwin Whittier Caswell, D.D., Middletown, Delaware

HE wonderful influence of motherhood upon childhood has been known in every age. The motto of the Roman Empire was "The hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world." What the mother is, as a rule, the child will be. Mothers have really been the heroines who have inspired the great pilgrimages, discoveries and achievements of every period in human history.

The mother, more than any other, affects the moral and spiritual part of human character. She not only imparts her own looks, nature and characteristics to the babe, but is its constant companion and teacher in its formative years. Her silent, unconscious influence is incalculable. The child is ever imitating and assimilating the mother nature. It is only in after life that men gaze backward and behold how a mother's hands and heart of love moulded their young lives and shaped their destiny.

Abigail Adams, the wife of John Adams, second President of the United States, occupied the distinction of being the wife of the second President and the mother of the sixth President, John Quincy Adams. We are proud to write that she was the daughter, the granddaughter and great-granddaughter of a clergyman. Morally and intellectually she stood at the head of the heroic women of the new Republic.

John Quincy Adams said of his mother: "My mother was an angel upon earth. She was a minister of blessing to all human beings within her sphere of action. Her heart was the abode of heavenly purity. She had known sorrow, but her sorrow was silent. If there is existence and retribution beyond the grave, my mother is happy."

The mother of Daniel Webster influenced her husband to sell their old homestead that they might devote the proceeds to the education of the two boys. This act of self-sacrificing love and parental solicitude has already and will forever affect the American nation for good, and, indirectly, the whole world.

Mary Ball, the mother of George Washington, is thus described by a playmate of George's early days. "She awed me in the midst of her kindness. Whoever has seen that inspiring air and manner, so characteristic in the Father of his Country, will remember the matron as she appeared when the presiding genius of her well-ordered household, commanding and being obeyed." Thank God, Washington's mother was a Christian woman! The Bible was her constant companion, and family prayers, both morning and evening, was the custom of the home, the servants of the household being invited to be present. When George was eleven years old his father died, leaving the six children to be cared for by Mary Washington. She survived

her husband, a widow for forty-six years.

Historians tell us that the father of Abraham Lincoln was an easy-going, shiftless, lazy character, passing much of his time in front of the solitary store, amusing his friends with stories and gossip. Mr. Lincoln acquired his story-telling conversational tendency from his father. He also, like him, had little appreciation of the acquiring of wealth. Nancy Hanks, his mother, was the inspiration of his great abilities. Dr. Holland, in his history, writes of her: "She had much in her nature that was truly heroic, and much that shrank from the rude life around her. A great man never drew his infant life from a purer or more womanly bosom than her own." She taught him to read and write and to study the few books within his reach. When the little Abe found a sentence that pleased him he would write it down on boards till he could get paper. Then he would repeat it till it was graven on his memory.

When Mr. Lincoln was only nine years old his mother died. His father soon after married Mrs. Johnson, who was a most exemplary woman, and did much in further moulding the character of the young man. Just before Mr. Lincoln started for his inauguration he visited his stepmother, who, as she embraced him, exclaimed, with deep emotion, "I am sure that I shall never see you again, for your enemies will assassinate you."

"Oh, no, mamma," exclaimed Mr. Lincoln, "they will not do that. Trust in the Lord and all will be well." The fear of the stepmother proved true—she never saw him again.

The mother of President Garfield was a woman of large gifts and deep piety. She taught her children the Bible, temperance, the love of liberty and loyalty to the country.

Just after President Garfield delivered his inaugural address, while tens of thousands of his countrymen were cheering him, he turned and kissed his aged mother—then he kissed his wife. Again the vast multitude applauded his action, honoring the tribute to his mother and wife in the one supreme moment of his life. When the news came to the mother that her son was shot, she cried out in her agony, "The Lord help me! How could any one be so cold-hearted as to want to kill my baby!" The last kiss of the mother was when her loving boy was in his casket, while multitudes were following the lamented Garfield to his tomb.

How true the words of Jean Paul Richter, who said: "To a man who has had a mother, all women are sacred for her sake!"

No doubt the most important period in the life of a child is that from four to ten years. The lessons of submission and obedience learned, as well as the habits of a religious life which are early formed, lay the foundations of character which is eternal. The great men of the race have been true to home and mother, as the mothers have been faithful to their children. Next to Almighty God, a child should love and honor his mother. "A mother may forget her child, but I will not forget thee."

Cannot be Answered

By J. M. Stanfield, Cleveland, Tennessee



HE following exposition of Colossians, 1: 16, 17, positively cannot be answered by those who deny the Deity of Jesus Christ, except by taking the position of an infidel and denying the truthfulness of these Scriptures or that of Paul, who wrote these wonderful statements. Suffice it to say that the following comments are taken from the writings of one of the greatest scholars the world has produced in the last century.

"For by him (Jesus Christ) were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist."—Col. 1:16, 17.

Four things are here asserted:

1. That Jesus Christ is the creator of the universe; of all things visible and invisible; of all things that had a beginning, whether they exist in time or in eternity.

2. That whatsoever was created was created for himself; that he was the sole end of his own work.

3. That he was prior to all creation, to all beings, whether in the visible or invisible world.

4. That he is the preserver and governor of all things; for by him all things consist.

* * *

Those preachers and churches that are ever trying something new to draw and hold the masses would do well to try once "Christ and Him crucified." There is absolutely nothing that will draw and hold the people like the old Gospel preached in its purity, pathos and power.—*Western Recorder*.

THE SANCTUARY

God the Soul's Portion

By William H. Bates, D.D., Greeley, Colorado



HE Lord is my portion, saith my soul; therefore will I hope in Him." Lamentations iii. 24.

Glancing over a newspaper the other day, my attention was arrested by one of the advertising columns, in which were repeated again and again, in heavier-faced type than the rest, the words *If You Want*. A responsive chord in my heart was struck, for I had a pressing need.

Hastening to examine the advertisement, I found that the wants which it proposed to satisfy were all of an earthly nature; and mine did not lie in that direction just then. Then I looked over the rest of the advertisements, and I found that they all, so far as they had anything to proffer, addressed themselves to what was simply earthly. That which they presented was all shut in by the narrow horizon of material things.

Then I thought of our great newspaper system and of how it apportioned its ministration to all the wants of men; and I said to myself, "Surely, if the Press be the ground of judgment, it would seem as though men are almost wholly given up to those things which belong to the natural, the temporal, the earthly." Then I queried: "Is it fair, though the Press be said to be the reflex of the life of the people, to take its data as our premises of deduction?" After making all the allowance that leniency and an interested charity would permit, it did seem as though it must be confessed that, speaking in large and round terms, men are given up to things pertaining to their lower nature. They are seeking an earthly portion. And this is where they are not true to themselves.

The ancients used to imagine that there was a great giant beneath Mt. Vesuvius, and that the volcanic voices and disturbances were due to his restless turnings and groanings. A parable.

Beneath the piled-up mountain of man's earthly needs, there is a mighty, restless want. It cannot be crushed out. Above all the din of earthly noises, it will make itself heard. Amid all the clamorings of earthly passions, it will assert itself with a persistence and

force which seem to voice the eternal. This want is the *soul want*. And let man satisfy every want of his lower nature, let him sate to the utmost all that belongs to the earthly, if *this* want be not met, he is really not satisfied at all. Nothing earthly can meet it. It must be met, if met at all, by the spiritual, the divine. The Lord is my Portion, saith my Soul; therefore will I Hope in Him.

I. *The text presents God as the Soul's Portion.*

There is first that which is natural, afterward that which is spiritual. Earthly things for earthly needs,—these are given in abundance. For the higher needs God presents us something higher—Himself. This is no mere sentiment, nor fancy, but fact. Oh, that a divine light would flash our thoughts out of common place, and lift them up and make real to us the truth that the Infinite God and the human soul can come together in one.

The great mistake which men make is, trying to satisfy the higher with the lower. If the most gifted of the world cannot accomplish this impossible thing, surely it is of no use for us of lesser degree to try.

1. At the very time when Christ was upon earth, saying "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God," there was a man who, scarcely in a figure, might be said to have the whole world. He was the absolute, undisputed, deified ruler of all that was fairest and richest in the kingdoms of the earth. There was no control to his power, no limit to his wealth, no restraint upon his pleasure.

To yield himself still more unreservedly to the boundless self-gratification of a voluptuous luxury, he not long after this time chose for himself a home on one of the loveliest spots of the earth's surface. It was an enchanting islet in one of the most softly delicious climates in the world. And what came of it all? He was as Pliny called him, *Tristissimus ut constat hominum*,—confessedly the most gloomy of men.

There, from that island, where on a scale so splendid he had tried the experiment of what happiness can be achieved by pressing the world's most absolute authority and its

most luxurious indulgences into his service, he wrote to his servile and corrupted Senate: "What to write to you, O Conscript Fathers, or what not to write, may all the gods and goddesses destroy me worse than I feel that they are daily destroying me, if I know." Thus wrote the Roman emperor, Tiberius.

Rulership, power, so coveted by men, cannot satisfy the *soul*.

To the same conclusion is the testimony of Louis XIV., whose confessions were so many convulsive shudderings and writhings with which he turned from death to superstition, until superstition led him blindfolded to death. I repeat: rulership, office, presidencies, power, chiefest power, which men covet so much, cannot satisfy the soul. An unsatisfying portion here.

2. Let us hear what Carlyle says of the great German poet, Schiller.

"The universe of human thought he had now explored and enjoyed, but he seems to have found no permanent contentment in any of its provinces. Many of his later poems indicate an increasing longing for some solution of the mystery of life; at times it is a gloomy resignation to the want and despair of any. His ardent spirit could not satisfy itself with things seen, though gilded with all the glories of intellect and imagination; it soared away in search of other lands, looking with unutterable desire for some surer and brighter home beyond the horizon of this world." This is a revelation of the inner life of Germany's noble, enthusiastic, philosophic, but unbelieving, poet.

Hear Goethe, speaking of himself in his seventy-fifth year: "When I look back on my early and middle life, and see how few remain of those who were young when I was young, I am reminded of a summer residence in a watering place. When we arrive, we form acquaintances with those who have come before us, but who will soon be leaving. The loss is painful, but then comes the second generation, with which we live for a while on terms most intimate. But then this passes away, and leaves us alone with the third, which arrives soon before our departure, and with which we have but little to do." And again: "I have often been praised as an especial favorite of fortune; and I will not myself complain. But at the bottom there has been nothing but trouble and labor; and I can well say that in my whole five and seventy years, I have not had four weeks of real pleasure. It was the eternal rolling of a stone that had always to be lifted up again

for a new start." So spoke the great voluptuary poet-idol of Germany.

However much poesy may minister to the aesthetic taste, the experience of these two masters of the poetic art shows us that all that belongs to its domain cannot satisfy the soul. An unsatisfying portion here.

3. We might pass from the realm of poesy to that of Art, and speak of Turner, who needed not Mr. Ruskin's wonderful periods to prove him the greatest landscape painter of modern times, if not of the world.

Writes a friendly hand: "The death of the great painter was as dismal as his life. He disappeared, nobody knew where, but was at last discovered by his old housekeeper. Refuged like a wild creature in that obscurity, fled from his vain fame, his useless hoards, the familiar circumstances of his long unlovely life, what thoughts possessed the dumb soul, mutely defiant of all human influences, in that dying gaze upon the light which had no pity for his failing vision! Too dark for imagination to enter upon, pitiful enough to silence even the necessary verdict of justice, is that last scene in the dark drama. The tragedy was over when the dark gleaming Thames, all muddy and miserable, yet glorified with light from heaven, faded from the closing eyelids of the old painter, upon whose murky life a light almost as glorious and as profoundly alien to the turbid stream it shone on, had blazed and glistened, but the tragedy is only ineffably pitiful, sad with real human failure and misery—not heroic nor touched with the elevation of sorrow. Here died a man, to whom, by strangest accident, had fallen such a glorious gift of genius as might have indemnified a human creature for all the agonies of existence. No compensation beautifies the dismal loss then consummated and brought to a conclusion."

The heart aches and turns away. Art had naught in it to satisfy the soul of one of the greatest geniuses of the world. An unsatisfying portion here.

4. Shall we turn from art to Philosophy? John Stuart Mill was brought up to ignore Christianity as a practical experimental fact in the life of a man, or of society. He depended upon philosophy, or what we might term "natural ideas," for the reform and regeneration of the world. And history must place him in the front rank of powerful thinkers.

He worked on. Says he: "I never, indeed, wavered in the conviction that happiness is the test of all rules of conduct, and the end

of life." At length, he says "It occurred to me to put the question directly to myself: 'Suppose that all your objects in life were realized; that all the changes in institutions and opinions which you are looking forward to, could be completely effected at this very instant: would this be a great joy and happiness to you?' And an irrepressible self-consciousness distinctly answered *No!* At this my heart sank within me; the whole foundation on which my life was constructed sank down." He says that these lines in Coleridge's "Dejection" exactly described his case: "A grief without a pang, void, dark, and drear, A drowsy, stifled, unimpassioned grief, Which finds no natural outlet or relief In word, or sigh, or tear."

Surely, if philosophy could have satisfied any man's soul, it should have satisfied his. An unsatisfying portion here.

5. And what of Wealth? In New York City I stood by the funeral procession that was about to carry to the grave all that was mortal of the richest man the world had seen in his generation. He was a railroad president. His own testimony was that his wealth was a care which destroyed comfort, and that all he got out of it was his board and clothes, the same as the commonest laborer.

His experience abundantly proved what we all know, but what we are loth to admit practically, that satisfaction is not found in outward conditions, but in inward.

St. Augustine says: "Poverty is the load of some, and wealth is the load of others, perhaps the greater load of the two. It may weigh down to perdition."

Wealth is an unsatisfying portion.

6. And what has Pleasure to offer the soul? Says a poet:

"It is true that the more we seek and pursue it, The more do we feel it inadequate, wholly Insufficient for man: a profound melancholy At the bottom of all, like the whirlpool, absorbs In its own bosom, the brittle, bright orbs Of those painted bubbles called—*pleasures.*"

An unsatisfying portion here.

7. Let us turn to Intellectual Culture in the wider range of general scholarship. What has it to offer?

German papers came to us several years ago telling a strange story and vouching for its truth.

A rich patron of the sciences and arts in Berlin offered prizes amounting to \$140 each for the best essays on the history of the Middle Ages, on astronomy, geology, poetry, and metaphysics; and, besides he offered prizes of about \$385 each for the best romance and the best poem.

Time rolled around, and a large number of productions were handed in. The committee of award from the faculties of Leipsic did their work, and were ready to give their verdicts. A vast audience assembled.

The prize for the essay on metaphysics was first announced. It belonged to the one who had sent in his essay under the name of "Hans Wildenstein." A young man, pale, poorly clad, his hair thin and already sprinkled with gray, and withal so wretched looking as to excite the sympathy of the audience, stepped forward and was greeted with a hearty round of applause. Receiving his prize, he quietly returned to his seat. One after another the titles of the best essays were read, and the accompanying envelope showed this same young man to be the author. The applause grew tumultuous as he, looking more weary every time, stepped forward. So intense was the excitement that the students, at the merest suggestion, would have carried him off in triumph.

The essays all examined, they turn next to the poem and the romance, the last being entitled "The Village Schoolmaster," and Berthold Auerbach, who was on the committee of award, pronounced it one of the most gracefully written stories he had ever read. A death-like stillness creeps over the audience. The accompanying envelopes were torn open. Behold! Max Markmann—for that was the real name of this young man—had won these prizes too! Hardly had he risen to receive the last prize, when he fell fainting to the floor. Carried to an adjoining room, he was barely aroused to consciousness, and in four hours he was a corpse, and, the physicians said, literally starved to death. An inordinate ambition had led him on not only to starve his soul—for ambition could not have led a *Christian* man such a course—but to starve his body. Dead in the hour of his triumph! What think you about God being the portion of such a man?

Do not misunderstand me to decry intellectual culture or true scholarship. Through long years I have consumed too much midnight kerosene, gas, and electricity, not to highly evaluate what caused this consumption. Man has more than a head: he has a heart. Intellectual culture, while it may help to, does not of itself produce, spirituality. Rhetoric does not regenerate. Syllogisms do not make saints. Mechanics do not beget morals. Logarithms do not lead to love. Chemistry does not precipitate Christly character.

Listen to me: *God created the soul in His*

own image, and only that which is spiritually congruous to Him can satisfy it. Truly says Augustine: "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and the heart never resteth till it findeth rest in Thee." "The Lord is my portion saith my soul."

I have already told you of Bengel, the great commentator, how a person who desired to see him at his private devotions secreted himself where he could look into his study, and how the great man, after studying his Bible far into the night, wearied, closed the book and looked upward as he sank back in his chair, complete soul-satisfaction radiant in every lineament of his countenance, and said: "Thou knowest blessed Jesus that we are on the same sweet old terms"; and he dropped off to sleep as sweetly as a babe in its mother's arms. The Lord was his portion.

But let us leave the realm of distinguished men, and come down into common life. Go with me to a certain home where a husband and father lies dying. The watching wife, as she turns to him once again, discovers that he has gone.

When the first burst of pent up grief had passed, a resolve is formed in the widow's heart which she proceeds to put into practice. She was alone with the corpse and her children. She took her six little ones, sleeping or waking, from their humble beds. But let me give you her own words:

"'Come, children,' I said, 'come. The Lord has taken away your earthly father; I must now give you afresh to your heavenly Father.' And placing the wondering infants on their knees around me, I knelt in their midst and prayed. I said: 'O my God! you have taken away these children's father. My heart is overwhelmed. What can I do with them? You must find them bread and enable me to bring them up for Thee.'" There was more to this prayer; but I pause. And these are her own words as to its blessed results: "I rose from my knees wonderfully strengthened. My load was gone. It was just as if I had heard the Lord say: 'I will do all you have asked.' My load was gone. I felt so strengthened and comforted, I returned the children to their beds, and prepared my husband for the grave."

Who will say that the Lord was not her portion? He was her portion, and a satisfying portion too. And, my hearer, it is such a God, who gives such help and comfort, who gives such satisfaction, that I preach to you.

But I need not multiply instances. I could appeal to men and women in this house to-

day, who could testify that the Lord is to them a portion, a blessed, satisfying portion.

II. *The text teaches that this Portion is a Matter of Consciousness.*

"The Lord is my portion, saith my soul." The soul is conscious of what it has. Is this true of all?

Says that noble man of God, Rev. Andrew Bonar, of Scotland: "The religion of the day is an *easy-minded* religion, without conflict and wrestling, without self-denial and sacrifice; a religion which knows nothing of the desperate struggle with the flesh and with the devil, day by day, making us long for resurrection deliverance, for the binding of the adversary, and for the Lord's return. It is a *second-rate* religion—a religion in which there is no largeness, no grandeur, no potency, no noblemindedness, no elevation, no self-devotendness, no all-sustaining love. It is a *hollow* religion, with a fair exterior, but with an aching heart—a heart unsatisfied, a soul not at rest, a conscience not at peace with God; a religion marked, it may be, by activity and excitement, but betraying all the while the consciousness of a wound hidden and unhealed within, and hence unable to animate to lofty doings, or supply the strength needed for such doings. It is a *feeble* religion, lacking the sinews and bones of harder times—very different from the indomitable, much-enduring, storm-braving religion, not merely of Apostolic days, but even of the Reformation. It is an *uncertain* religion: that is to say, it is not rooted in *certainty*; it is not the outflowing of a soul assured of pardon, and rejoicing in the filial relationship between itself and God. Hence there is no liberty of service, for the question of personal acceptance is still an unsettled thing; there is a working for *pardon*, but not from *pardon*. All is thus bondage, heaviness, irksomeness. There is a speaking for God, but it is with a faltering tongue; there is a laboring for God, but it is with fettered hands; there is a moving in the way of his commandments, but it is with a heavy drag upon our limbs. Hence the inefficient, uninfluential character of our religion. It does not tell upon others, for it has not yet fully told upon ourselves. It falls short of its mark, for the arm that drew the bow is paralyzed."

How true to fact this representation is, you perhaps can judge as well as I. And I do not wonder that such a religion affords no consciousness to the soul that the Lord is its portion.

When Mr. Moody was in England the

first time, a friend introduced him to a Christian gentleman from Dublin. The gentleman inquired if he were an "O and O Christian." Mr. Moody did not know what he meant, and upon inquiring he obtained the answer, "I wish to know whether you are an Out and Out Christian?" Who that knows Mr. Moody, or his work and his sayings, doubts his consciousness of the Lord's being his portion. He has it because he is an out-and-out Christian.

I know a minister to whom a member of his church went and said with great frankness: "Do you know, Mr. —, I like you ever so much: you make religion so *cheerful*"; and yet there is a member of the same church who does not like his preaching at all, because "He makes religion such a *horrid thing*." These diverse sentiments in regard to the same preaching! I suspect the reason of the difference must be in the kinds of religion possessed: one the out-and-out religion, the other the "religion of the day."

It was the "Out and Out," whole-hearted religion that enabled David with conscious happiness to say: "The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup" (Ps. xvi. 5); that enabled Asaph to say: "My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion forever" (Ps. 73: 26); that enabled Paul to say: "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day" (2 Tim. i. 12); that enabled Jeremiah to say in the text: "The Lord is my portion, saith my soul; therefore will I hope in Him." I know no reason, so far as the Lord is concerned, why all Christians may not have the consciousness that the Lord is their portion; yes, may not enjoy the sentiment of the hymn we have often sung:

"Blessed assurance, Jesus is mine!
Oh, what a foretaste of glory divine!
Heir of salvation, purchase of God,
Born of His Spirit, washed in His blood.
This is my story, this is my song,
Praising my Saviour all the day long."

III. *The text shows the effect of possessing this Portion, viz., Hopefulness: "Therefore will I hope in Him."*

During the Civil war, a colonel who commanded a brigade where sickness was prevalent, was required by his superior officer to prohibit religious meetings among his soldiers, on the ground that religion depressed their spirits and injured their health. But careful examination was made, and it was found that

the ratio of deaths was 1/8 of the Christians to 2/5 of the godless; or, giving a common denominator, 5/40 of Christians to 16/40 of the impenitent. Religion bad for the health? Religion gloomy? Not a bit of it.

Is the Lord my portion? Then the resources of the Infinite God—the infinity of His wisdom, the infinity of His power, and these guided by infinite love—are in reserve for me according to my need.

This test, taken from the Book of *Lamentations* too, should put to an end, at once and forever, those common but false conceptions of religion which confound it with melancholy, gloominess, monkery, monasticism, sullen stoicism, or sour phariseism. The Scriptures abundantly show that cheerfulness is not only a friend to grace, but that it is the fruit of grace; that religion does not consist in melancholy passions, a dejected face, a depressed mind, but that it is joy, life, freedom; that joy in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for temporal blessings, for divine Providence, for supplies of grace, for victory over sin, for the hope of glory, is great, abundant, exceeding, animating, full of glory and forevermore.

I have read somewhere that among some of the South Sea Islanders they have a compound word for our simple little word Hope, as expressive as it is beautiful. The word is *mana-olana*, or *swimming thought*. It is that which floats and keeps its head aloft above the waters when the waves and storms are howling fearfully around. Hope—the swimming thought!

The soul that truly hopes in God shall never go down. How tempestuous soever be the wave, it shall ride serenely; how severe soever be the storm, it shall sing amid it all:

"My cheerful hope can never die,
If Thou, my God, art near;
Thy grace can raise my comforts high,
And banish every fear."

I ask you to contrast, in your own mind, the man who has God for his portion, with the man who has not. Which is the better off, for *this* world as well as the next? and which had you rather be?

And remember that this portion is a matter of consciousness, its possession a conscious joy.

To you who have it, I have not any appeal to make today, except it be to say: Cherish it, and give God the glory. God bless you.

To you who have it not—and I wish to appeal to you as individuals, irrespective of profession, circumstance, or any extraneous thing—let me come right down to the actual

state of your hearts. You who are restless and tossed, whose hungry, pressing soul-wants are not met; you, who like the devotees of power, poesy, art, philosophy, wealth, pleasure, intellectual culture, are forever seeking and with your findings are still not satisfied and in that way never can be—it behooves you to think of them soberly, candidly, honestly, and, thinking upon them, to act, *to choose*, to choose God for your portion.

Oh, you need the lifting, the *floating*, power of a divine hope in your heart. You need it not only for the experiences of your life—your past experience shows what life is without it—but you need it when you come to the great Adventure, life's outgoing. Letting go this to which you are clinging and which satisfies not, choose the Lord for your portion. Will you, my brother?

Then when your flesh and your heart fail-
eth, God will be the strength of your heart
and your portion forever.

The Shepherd and his Sheep

John x. 1-16.

I.—The marks of the sheep are:

1. They know his voice.
2. They hear his voice.
3. They follow him.
4. They flee from strangers.

Do you?

II.—The marks of the True Shepherd:

1. Enters by the Door.
2. Calls them.
3. Leads them.
4. Sacrifices himself for them.

III.—The marks of the Good Shepherd:

1. He knows them intimately.
2. They know him.
3. He cares for each one.
4. He lays down his life for them.
5. He gives them eternal life.

God's Mercy

Numbers 14:19

"The greatness of Thy Mercy"

I. The Characteristics of God's Mercy.

1. Great. Ps. 36:5; 119:64; 86:13.
2. Plenteous. Ps. 86:5,15; Eph. 2:4.
3. Everlasting. Ps. 103:17; 100:5.
4. Tender. Ps. 119:156; 40:11.
5. Universal. Ps. 145:9.

II. To Whom It Flows Out.

1. To the wicked. Isa. 55:7.
2. To the backslider. Jer. 3:12.
3. To the believer. Ps. 103:17.
4. To the godly desirous of advancement. Ps. 67.
5. To the fatherless. Hos. 14:3.
6. To the afflicted. Isa. 49:13.

III. What He Does in Mercy.

1. Pardons. Heb. 8:12.
2. Satisfies the soul. Ps. 90:14; 145:16.
3. Preserves us. Ps. 61:6,7.
4. Prevents us. Lam. 3:22.

IV. How We Are to Regard It.

1. Rejoice in it. Ps. 31:7.
2. Trust in it. Ps. 52:8.

Emblems of the Holy Spirit

A Bible Reading

1. Wind. Jno. iii. 8, Invisible, mysterious, powerful. Ezek. 37:1-10, Penetrating, enlivening, invigorating.

2. Water. Jno. iv. 14, Indwelling and cleansing. Jno. vii. 38, 39, Outflowing and reviving.

3. Wine. Acts ii. 15; Eph. v. 18.

Wine Filled

- (1) Temporary exhilaration
- (2) Quickens but perverts energies
- (3) Encourages to bold and evil deeds

Spirit Filled

- Abiding joy
- Quickens and devicts rightly
- Encourages to bold and noble deeds

4. Dove. Matt. iii. 16; Gen. i. 2. Peace, brooding, hovering.

5. Oil. Lev. xiv. 10-18; Lk. x. 33-35; Lev. viii. 12, 14, 30; Lk. iv. 18. Anointing; sacrifice; power.

6. Fire. Lk. xxiv. 32, Ablaze with love. Isa. vi. 5-8, Intense zeal. 1 Cor. iii. 11-15, Illuminating and discriminating. Acts ii. 2,3, Wind—Fire, one fans the other, and together is their power most fully seen.

* * *

There is a law of dynamics to the effect that for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. There is a law in Christianity that the ascent is equivalent to the descent; that the lower we get the higher we rise; that the deeper we drink in the cup of our Saviour's death, the deeper we shall drink in the cup of his resurrection and ascension to glory.—F. B. Meyer, D. D.

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

By A. William Lewis, D.D., Long Pine, Nebraska

Miriam is beloved by millions today as one of the heroines of the Old Testament. Yet we seldom hear anything about her except in an exclusive cloister, known to some of us. Let us take her for our study during May. In some latitudes the month of May may have its bitter storms; so Miriam, beautiful and sweet and full of life as May, was subject to the storms of human nature.

Miriam the Rescuer of Moses

Exodus 2: 1-10

When Moses was exposed in his ark of bulrushes, among the reeds of the Nile, Miriam, "his sister," was sent by the Mother to see what would happen. The daughter of Pharaoh was charmed by the tears of the rosy, lovely child; and she said, "This is one of the Hebrews' children." Miriam heroically seized her opportunity, unabashed by royalty. "Shall I go and call thee a nurse of the Hebrew women, that she may nurse the child for thee? And Pharaoh's daughter said unto her, Go. And the maiden went and called the child's Mother. * * * And the child grew; and she brought him unto Pharaoh's daughter, and he became her son."

Miriam was a model "older sister." In many families some older sister has much to do with the care and education of the younger children. Often they find it hard and complain. Others, more heroic and more loving, find it the joy of their life. This is the budding of true womanhood.

Miriam was obedient to her Mother. This is a vital need of children. The peril today among the young is the lack of this parental authority and of dutiful obedience. Obedience to parents shields the young from unknown and unseen dangers, and saves from a recklessness that ruins many lives. The Mosaic laws were wise in making reverence for parents a cardinal virtue.

Miriam entered into the plan of her Mother with enthusiasm. She was a worthy daughter of this "mother in Israel." If the children of today only knew the highest wisdom more perfectly, they too would become enthusiastic in helping their parents form and develop plans for exalted character and heroic service. This is the ideal God has set before us. "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee."

Miriam a Jealous Rebel

Numbers 12: 1-15

Miriam had one weakness in her character, common to most women, and to many men. She was jealous of the wife of her Brother, Moses. She was a "Cushite woman." The sister-in-law may be as much criticised as the mother-in-law. How often we see a sister by marriage very unsisterly! Both Miriam and Aaron afterwards acknowledged their mistake, their sin.

Miriam allowed her jealousy to blind her eyes and becloud her mind and befog her heart. She had loved her little Brother, Moses, and had rejoiced to save him, and help care for him. She had gloried in the honor that afterwards had come to him. She loyally supported him in his great work as a leader and law-giver of their chosen nation. She had seen how God favored him, and made him His representative. "Wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my servant, against Moses?" Jealousy is blind, and cruel, and reckless.

Miriam was saved by the judgment of God, tempered by mercy. She was summoned to His presence, at the Tent of Meeting, and she heard His voice from "the pillar of cloud." After He had departed she was white with leprosy. She stood condemned by her own conscience, and punished by her God.

Her restoration came through prayer, her prayer and the prayer of Aaron, her accomplice, in rebellion. "Heal her, O God, I beseech Thee." After seven days she was brought again into the camp; and the people journeyed.

Miriam learned by sad experience what she might easily have learned by reason and love. That would have been wisdom, and health. Many today have not yet learned this lesson. They say that there is no distinction between the sacred and the profane, between the Bible and other books, between the Lord's

Day and other days, between the anointed of the Lord and others, between the Church and other organizations. Such should study the life and word of Jesus Christ. "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm."

Miriam the Prophetess

Exodus 15: 1-21

Miriam shared in the honor given to Moses by Jehovah, because she was the sister and the helper of Moses. From his childhood she had been very closely associated with him, and had sympathized with him, when he returned from Horeb to be Israel's Deliverer. She was naturally proud of her younger brother. In return for this her spirit caught something of his spirit; and Jehovah rewarded her faithfulness with a special portion of His Own Spirit. By the kindness of God she was a prophetess. "And Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances."

Being made a prophetess was the highest honor possible to Miriam. Moses was the only one in those days honored above the prophets. "If there be prophet among you, I Jehovah will make Myself known unto him in a vision, I will speak with him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so; * * * with him will I speak mouth to mouth, even manifestly, and not in dark speeches." In these days God reveals Himself by His Holy Spirit to every true child, to everyone that is spiritually minded. This is a greater honor than to be chosen the President of the United States of America. How much greater is the honor of being called by God to become His Ambassador, His Minister, in the Gospel Ministry! If all understood this there would not be such a dearth of candidates for "Holy Orders." We should glory in our hardships and handicaps materially when we know that God considers the Gospel Ministry His great honor and trust. To be honored by God is far better than to be applauded by men.

Miriam's chief ambition was to do God's will and glorify Him. She gave all the credit of success to Him. "Sing ye to Jehovah; for He hath triumphed gloriously." Ambition is the badge of manhood and womanhood. Jesus had it in perfection. Ambition becomes an evil if it is a wrong one, or is followed in a wrong way. Jesus said, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work." This ambition in our life should lead us every day to seek the guid-

ance and the strength of the Holy Spirit. We should in everything acknowledge our dependence upon God and our faith in Him; and in worship, public and private, confess Him before our fellowmen. Seeking above all else to do His will, we shall have the vision, and receive His Approval.

The Death of Miriam

Numbers 20: 1

An obituary in the Bible means more than the one in the newspapers. "And the people abode in Kadesh; and Miriam died there, and was buried there." Miriam had lived a remarkable life; and "being dead, she yet speaks." Having lived such a life, it was fitting that her funeral should be a notable one. Many living in this Christian land expect a big funeral and much praise, no matter what kind of a life they have lived.

When Miriam was buried no mention would be made of her one big mistake, trying to usurp the place of Moses. Death throws a mantle over the faults of the departed. Most people heed the command, "Speak not evil against the dead." It is yet more praiseworthy not to speak evil against the living. Many save their attentions until their friend is dead, then they give flowers, expensive and perishable and too late, except for show. Let us show the kindness to our friends while they are living.

When Miriam was buried, all the jealousy felt by other women would be forgotten. She had been a conspicuous figure in public life for many years; but now she was silent. Jealousy devours the living, not the dead. It is amazing to what extent jealousy sours the sweetest lives and destroys usefulness. It scorns facts, taking hearsay as its cup of moonshine. "Requiescat in pace."

When Miriam was buried, her good life followed her. Her good influence lived still in the lives of those that loved her. The memory of her would be told and retold. Women would glory in the fact that a woman had done so much among her wandering people, to make life worth living, and to give hope for the future.

When Miriam died she went into the spirit world to meet again the life she had lived, purified from its mistakes. "Teach us so to number our days that we may get a heart of wisdom." The days of the past have been sealed and sent on before us, as by parcel post, not to be opened till we arrive.

LIBRARY TABLE

Reviews of Recent Books

By Professor L. S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio

The Origin of Biblical Traditions: Hebrew Legends in Babylonia and Israel. By Professor Albert T. Clay. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. Price \$3.00.

We thank God as well as the author for this monumental book. Dr. Clay is a well-known archeologist, who has made a vast amount of original research, and who therefore is treading on familiar ground in this work. The book comprises a series of lectures delivered by the author at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mount Airy, Philadelphia, Pa., where they met with a warm reception. In his previous books ("The Empire of the Amorites," "Amurru," and "A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform") he took the position that the Hebrews did not borrow the early Biblical narratives of creation, the fall, the deluge, etc., from the mythology of the Babylonians, as the negative critics contended, but that the Biblical stories were original Hebrew productions, and therefore the pagan myths were only later corruptions of the true original Semitic sources. In view of the tendency of nations to degenerate, this seems to be a most plausible view. On the face of it, the theory that the Hebrews would borrow their narratives from the corrupt polytheistic mythology of pagan nations does not appear to be reasonable. How does it occur that the Hebrews rinsed the heathen stories of all their puerilities and idolatries, and gave the world a monotheistic conception of the universe? Without divine inspiration they could not have done this; with divine inspiration it was not necessary to borrow from pagan sources.

But Dr. Clay does not argue on general principles. He is a technical archeologist; therefore he takes nothing for granted, but by a collation of many facts, large and minute, he makes his inductions. One of the most significant points he makes—it is also a most valuable Christian apologetic—is this: that the Hebrews did not emerge like a lot of savage nomads, tribe after tribe, from the Arabian desert, but were indigenous to Palestine as far back as archeology can trace them, and that they carried the Hebrew account of creation eastward to the Babylonians and

Sumerians. This is a most reasonable view, and agrees with the Biblical teaching.

This work is a most effective refutation of the so-called Babylonism of the Frederick Delitzsch type and all who have followed in his train. Delitzsch was also answered by Dr. Eduard Koenig from another viewpoint in his noteworthy book, "Bibel und Babel." Let the good work go on.

Nyilak and Other African Sketches. By Mabel Easton. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, etc.

Such sweet and simple stories! Such a glamor of romance! Such a far-away atmosphere! Mabel Easton knows how to tell the story of the black people of the African Inland Mission, and to make them real people before your eyes. She speaks so lovingly of them. Of course, all the stories are true stories. For that reason her book gives much information regarding the peculiar customs, the queer psychological processes and the strange religious conceptions of the African people far back in the hinterlands of their vast continent. She also shows clearly that the gospel adds much joy to their lives, rids them of enslaving superstitions, and greatly improves the morale among them. It is such a good, cheery, wholesome missionary book that we wish all our readers could have the pleasure of reading it.

The Starry Universe the Christian's Future Empire. By Horace C. Stanton, Ph.D., D.D., S.T.D. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago and London. Price \$1.75 net.

To prove the usefulness and popularity of this book, we are glad to announce that we have just received a copy of the fifth edition. This indicates the popular interest felt in problems of the future life. People cannot naturally be secularists; they are always asking the question that will not down, "If a man die, shall he live again?" But here is not an ordinary discussion of the joys of the future life, but a view that greatly enlarges and enhances one's purview and adds much inspiration to the doctrine. Here is the main point of the book: "The Scriptural indications that God's children are to inherit all

His illimitable kingdoms; from heaven as the metropolis, they will explore and enjoy them all." That certainly is a grand prospect. It puts fiber into the hearts of men of faith and action. Dr. Stanton has gone through the Bible, and has gathered together and correlated all the teaching relative to his theme, and has made his thesis most convincing.

But that is not all: he also knows physical science; thus he is conversant with the various forms of matter from the most palpable to the most subliminal, and sees the possibilities of its glorification in consonance with material data. He also is familiar with the facts of astronomy, and thus he knows the possibilities of the vast cosmos for the eternal residence and delectation of man after his body has been resurrected, glorified and restored to its immortal mate, the soul.

The Making and Meaning of the New Testament. By James H. Snowden, D.D., LL.D. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price \$2.25.

In this book Dr. Snowden tells us how the New Testament was made, what it means, sets forth clearly its historical background, analyzes its various books, limns its several characters, especially Jesus Christ and Paul, and defends its integrity, authenticity and divine inspiration. There are a few points on which the critical reader might be inclined to differ. For example, on page 11 he says: "The soul of the Jew as quickened by the breath of the Holy Spirit of God is the soil out of which *grew* the Old Testament and blossomed the New," etc. That is partly, though not entirely, the lingo of the modernists, who seem to object to any direct statement that God revealed things to His prophets and apostles. They are always speaking about the Bible "growing" and its having come from the "experience" of the Jewish people. But it was not the Jews as a whole or as a nation that produced the Holy Scriptures; they were given first to the divinely chosen and inspired prophets, who in turn proclaimed them to the people. Why not put it just as the Bible itself does?

But Dr. Snowden says so many things in vindication of divine inspiration that he certainly cannot be classed with the shredding liberalists, but must be regarded as evangelical. Note how fully and convincingly he shows the vital and necessary relation of the Old and the New Testaments. He indicates how many times the New Testament writers and Christ Himself appeal to the Old Testament as of divine authority. The four gos-

pels are needed to fill out the life of Christ, and they may be beautifully harmonized. He defends the Johannine authorship of all the book ascribed to the Apostle John. While Hebrews was probably not written by Paul, yet it is just as much inspired as if it were.

Famous Figures of the Old Testament. By William Jennings Bryan. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, etc. Price \$1.50 net.

When a great and good man draws the portraits of great and good characters, the result is a very satisfying piece of work. Mr. Bryan takes the Biblical narratives at their face value, and hence is untroubled about the small critical questions that might blur the Old Testament heroes. Here Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, and the rest of them stand out in clear relief before the mind; no blurring, no misconceiving, no saying who and what the personages should have been according to some subjective view or philosophy. Compare Bade's or Sanders' sketchy, shadowy limning of Moses and David with these cameo representations by Mr. Bryan. With him they are real, living characters. Accepting the historicity of the Bible, Mr. Bryan is able to draw true lessons of God's care for His people from these concrete examples. It is not fiction writers who instruct us in the Bible, but history writers. How much more vital are the lessons to be learned than if the characters were to be looked upon as mythical or fictitious. Mr. Bryan treats the Bible reverently. It is God's book. He sometimes ventures briefly but tellingly into the field of apologetics, as, for example, when he defends the historicity of the book of Jonah.

Nineteenth Century Evolution and After. By Marshall Dawson. The Macmillan Company, New York.

This is a strange book. It reveals a peculiar type of mind. It is an honest and strenuous but futile attempt to harmonize Christianity and evolution. In this effort the author reads his own interpretation into both nature and the Bible. His account of the "growing of a backbone" is surely a misguided and strained sample of human speculation. Can anybody believe that a backbone was evolved in the way described on pages 7-10? If such conjecture is science, we confess we do not know what science is. And if it is not science, what is the use of trying to correlate it with the Christian religion? Let us wait until we know from actual data whether backbones and brains were produced

by such an evolutionary process as our author depicts before we give up the clear, literal, honest interpretation of the Bible. As our author treats nature, so he treats the Scriptures. By twisting and manipulating certain passages and omitting even the slightest reference to others, he forces them into a sort of quasi-harmony with his preconceived notion that all things have been evolved.

Beginning Again at Ararat. By Mabel Evelyn Elliott, M.D., Medical Director of Near East Relief. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, London and Edinburgh. Price \$2.00 net.

Reader, here is one of the most absorbing narratives ever written. It is not a piece of fiction. Without disparaging good fiction in the least, this story is more enthralling and more important than any book of fictitious writing could ever be. It tells us in the most simple and graphic way of the work of the American Near East Relief, under the direction of the gifted and self-sacrificing author, Dr. Elliott. While she tells about her own work, she is so modest and unassuming that she does not make herself the heroine of her wonderful story, but gives much credit for real bravery to other people who were associated with her. The heroic days have not passed. The late war, and the wars in the Near East which came as a disastrous aftermath, have brought out the noble and virile character of many people.

But who is to be held responsible for the great suffering of the Armenians throughout the past centuries? Well, much of it lies at the door of selfish and grasping diplomats who shuffled the cards in the material interests of their several nations. It would seem that the rich oil fields of Asia Minor, the Bagdad Railroad, and other commercial interests bulked larger in the eyes of the diplomats than did the lives and salvation of the Armenians and other helpless oriental peoples. The bright spot in this narrative is the unselfish spirit displayed by the American Christians who sent Dr. Elliott and her assistants to minister to human need. This is an illuminating book.

Jesus, Lover of Men: An Interpretation of the Records. By Wilton Rix. George H. Doran Company, New York. Price \$1.50 net.

There is no doubt that this is a fascinating book. In some ways it sets forth Christ in a vivid and striking way that becomes intensely absorbing, and at times moving. The language is chaste and terse, and the pages are broken

up into brief sentence paragraphs that make the book seem like a succession of brilliant epigrams. Indeed, the author has mastered the art of proverb making. The records of the gospels are followed in part, and some of the most impressive incidents of Christ's life and some of His sayings are interpreted with a fine originality.

Having said so much for the book, we wish we could give it our full endorsement—but that is not possible. It is a Ritschian construction of the life and doctrine of Christ. He is represented as "the lover of men," as a profound ethical and spiritual teacher, a wonderful interpreter of God, a willing martyr to what He believed to be His mission; but He is not presented as the divine Redeemer, the atoning Saviour. He is pictured in too humanistic a way; His divine nature, while not entirely ignored, is surely treated very inadequately. Why were His unique conception and virgin birth wholly omitted? Are they not a part of "the records"? Here is not a complete interpretation of the Biblical account, but a subjective interpretation of them, by the convenient method of laying the stress on the human part of Christ's character and quietly ignoring what is said about his being "God manifest in the flesh," "the Word made flesh," "Immanuel, God with us." A Christ who was so often in doubt, so often mistaken and so grievously "disappointed" at His seeming failures can hardly be looked upon by sinful men as the One who is "omnipotent to save."

Divine Healing: Does God Perform Miracles Today? By R. A. Torrey, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.

There are so many faddists and charlatans today who profess the power of "divine healing" that it is a real godsend that one so capable as Dr. Torrey has been led to write this book on the subject. Why is Dr. Torrey so profound an interpreter of God's Word? First, because he accepts it as divine from beginning to end, and that puts him *en rapport* with its spirit and teaching; second, because he has the gift of reason and sanity of judgment, so that he is able to relate and correlate the whole teaching of the Word on any subject. This keeps him from becoming one-sided and fantastic. With this kind of a mind he has studied the problem of divine healing. He believes in it; there are times when God really does intervene. At such times he gives faith to the patient or some other Christian to offer the true and availng prayer. But God does not always will to heal the sick. Dr.

Torrey points out many such instances right from the Bible. If it were God's will for everybody to recover from sickness, nobody would die. Yet the Bible says, "It is given men once to die, and after that the judgment." Dr. Torrey gives the most clear-cut exegesis of James 5: 14, 15 ("Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church," etc.) that we have ever seen. Get this book, see how reasonable the Bible is on this great and important subject of the healing of the sick. Dr. Torrey exposes the fanatics on this doctrine, and then points out clearly the wholesome and rational doctrine of the divine Word.

Protestantism: Its Principles and Reasons. By Rev. R. Ditterich. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 826 N. LaSalle street, Chicago, Ill. Price 30 cents.

What is Protestantism? It is not merely a negative protest against something wrong. It is a positive testimony to the truth, for the word is from *pro*, for, or in favor of, and *testis*, witness; so it means a witness for. For example, Protestantism, while it protests against the errors of Rome, bears positive witness to the Bible as the ultimate and infallible authority, to justification by faith, salvation by grace, and the finished work of Christ in the atonement. This is the kind of information one obtains from this valuable book. In addition, it points out the absurdity of the papal claims, the Scriptural and historical testing of those claims, how the pope's power was gained, Rome's view of marriage, heroes of the Protestant churches, and what Protestantism needs today. The subject is well and effectively handled. We give the book our heartiest commendation.

The Unique Historical Value of the Book of Jonah. By W. C. Stevens, Principal of the Midland Bible School, Shenandoah, Iowa. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Price \$1.00 net.

How perennial and inexhaustible is the Word of God! So much has been written on the book of Jonah that one would have thought it could not be considered from another viewpoint. But it can, and here we have it in this unique and illuminating book about a unique Biblical character. Our author accepts the book of Jonah as historical, and gives convincing reasons for his view; at least, they are convincing to the real Biblical Christian. But this is not his great purpose. Accepting the book as true, it has a strategic historical value in the whole process of the

world and the kingdom of God. If it is fiction, it has little value, because then you do not know whether the lessons it seems to teach are true or not. We wish that men like Marcus Dods (see "The Expositor's Bible") could see this point. What are the great and fundamental historical facts that are brought out in the book of Jonah and that give it a key position? They are these, summarized from Mr. Stevens' volume: God's universal presence in history, His universal personal government, His compassion toward all His creatures, the Son of God the arbiter of human history, Israel's unique place in human history, the probationary state of Gentile nations and empires, Christ's redemptive person and work in the unfolding plan of the world's history. This last point follows because Christ spoke of "the sign of the Prophet Jonah" in connection with His redemptive purpose. How clear that, if the Jonah narrative is historical, it gives an epitome of all history! The whole Christian church is under obligation to Principal Stevens for setting forth the true value of a Biblical book that has not received its due appraisement among Biblical teachers.

Gospel Sword Thrusts. By Rev. Mark A. Matthews, D.D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Wash. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Price \$1.25 net.

Indeed, this book is rightly named; it contains genuine "sword thrusts." Dr. Matthews could not be pointless if he wanted to. He takes a definite aim and drives right straight to his objective. And what is that objective? Primarily it is to save souls and lead them to a knowledge of the Christ. However, in order to do this, he must often clear the way of error. So he drives off the modernistic errors from the souls of men, and then, the coast being clear, he drives home to the sinner's heart and conscience. He is a fearless protagonist of the fundamental doctrines. His success as a pastor is phenomenal, for he has charge of the largest church numerically in the world. The secret of it is his spiritual power through the living dynamic of the Word of God, which he accepts without any ifs or peradventures. In this book you will find sermons on God, the Holy Trinity, the threefold program of the Trinity (very suggestive), the scarlet line (sermon on the atonement), the virgin birth of our Lord, contending for the faith, the infallible test, the crime-wave producers, the old and the new Modernism. If the liberalist and skeptic are not convinced by the logic of these addresses intellec-

tually conceived, they ought to be convinced by the spiritual force and the absolute conviction of truth pulsing through these lines. Here is truth on fire, warming the true believer, burning the unbeliever.

Talks to High School Boys. By John M. Holmes. The Macmillan Company, New York.

These are real and virile talks to boys. They are religious in a manly way that will appeal to strong and healthy boys of the high school age. At first one might question the propriety of such a title as, "The Fun of Being a Christian," but the author is not irreverent at all; he simply means to inculcate the pure, uplifting joy of the truly Christian life. Mr. Holmes presents religion in such a way as to appeal to whatever is best and strongest in the boy nature. The boy does not want sentimentality, and he finds none here; yet he is taught that it is manly to love God, to trust in Christ, and make Him one's friend, and always to do the right and fine thing. Many of the illustrations are taken right from boy life. A manly man composed and delivered these talks, and they will help to make manly boys, who will be too high-minded to do anything mean and unworthy of them. Yet there is nothing in the talks to make Christian boys Pharisaical.

1001 Bible Problems. By Rev. T. H. Darlow, M.A. George H. Doran Company, New York. Price \$1.00 net.

A quotation from the author's preface will indicate the author's evangelical attitude: "If a man will take pains to study the Bible seriously, apart from preconceived theories about it, he will not surrender to obscurantists on the right nor to destructive critics on the left. After all has been said, for plain English people Christianity means the religion of the Bible." That is the right view. In a previous issue of this journal we gave the author's book, "At Home in the Bible," a cordial notice. We wish to commend the present volume no less heartily. It is a book that is intended to promote Bible study, whether in the privacy of the home or in the Sunday school or the week-day Bible school. The plan of the work is as follows: In the first part of the book occur 1001 questions; these are answered by the appropriate Biblical passage, giving the book, chapter and verse, in the second part of the book; the numeration corresponding in each part. For example: "1. Which is the longest verse in the Bible?" Answer: "1. Esther viii. 9." The Biblical passage is not quoted, but is simply cited,

so that the pupil will be compelled to hunt for it in the Bible, and thus learn to handle the Bible.

The Greatest Force on Earth: The Power of Intensified Prayer. By Thomas Payne, D.D. George H. Doran Company, New York. Price \$1.35 net.

A book that is recommended by such evangelical and spiritually minded men as Rev. H. T. Chilvers and Dr. Dinsdale T. Young is worthy of attention and is sure to be based on the right principles. Here is a writer who believes in prayer with all his might, and has no fear that God cannot govern the universe and at the same time intervene to help His children when they call upon Him. The author does not lose himself in misty speculations about the *modus operandi* of prayer and its relation to natural law, but shows by concrete examples that God has answered prayer, and has done it, too, without disturbing the normal order of the universe. One by one the prayers of Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Hannah, Elijah, Daniel, Christ in Gethsemane, the apostles in the upper room just before Pentecost, are considered, their power analyzed, and their effectiveness portrayed.

A List of Text Books. Compiled by the Authors named below. Christian Fundamentals Association, 1020 Harmon Place, Minneapolis, Minn. Price 10 cents.

This booklet contains an extensive list of text-books for colleges, Bible schools and theological seminaries. They have been selected and are recommended by the Committee on Text Books for the Christian Fundamentals Association. This committee, which was appointed at the Fort Worth convention, consists of the following educators: Professor Leander S. Keyser, D.D., Springfield, Ohio, chairman; Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Prof. J. A. Huffman, D.D., Marion, Ind.; Prof. James H. Bole, A.M., Wheaton, Ill.; Rev. John Thomas, M.A., Porthcawl, Glamorgan, England. The committee recommends all the books in the list for use in scholastic institutions that stand for the Christian faith in its integrity. They give the caution, however, that several of them must be used with discrimination in a few places; as, for example, W. H. Turton (in his "The Truth of Christianity") and Dr. James H. Snowden, who use the term evolution in rather an elastic sense. There are, besides these, a few authors who have published other works than those listed which are somewhat on the lib-

eralistic order, although those included in the list are regarded as safe and thorough. Among authors of this kind may be named Drs. Henry C. Sheldon, Milton S. Terry, and George A. Barton. The committee regarded the books by these authors that have been included in their list as too good for text-book purposes to be omitted; but this does not mean that they endorse other works by the same authors which show decided leanings toward liberalism.

It was not the purpose of the committee to give a list of texts on all the disciplines in college curricula, but only on those that have a more or less direct relation to the Christian religion. For Bible schools and theological seminaries the lists are fuller. The books are believed to be representative of evangelical Christianity and at the same time of the most thorough-going scholarship. For almost every discipline, besides the text-books cited, a strong list of books is recommended for supplementary reading, study, and special research. Much work and thought have been expended by the committee on this list, and they earnestly hope that it may lead Christian educators to adopt such books as will conserve the plenary faith of the gospel, correct the false speculations of science and philosophy, and, at the same time, incite to the finest kind of mental discipline and the keenest desire for the truth. Some excellent text-books may have been inadvertently omitted. The members of the committee will welcome suggestions from Christian educators, so that, when a second edition is issued, other good text-books may be added. Send for the list, and see what you think of it. Perhaps it will suggest the very text for which you have been looking.

Additional Book Notes

Two recent booklets from the pen of Dr. James M. Gray, President of the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, afford us much pleasure and edification. Dr. Gray knows the Bible well and also knows how to defend it. The first of these booklets is, "The Outposts of the Citadel, or, Why I Believe the Bible Will Stand." The outposts of the citadel of Biblical integrity are the authenticity, the truth and the inspiration of the Bible. Dr. Gray explains and upholds these facts with acuteness. He appeals to history, archeology, Biblical research and Christian experience and thus in every way reinforces confidence

that the Bible will stand. 7c each; 75c per doz.; \$5.50 per hundred.

In view of present controversies in the church, inflicted by the modernists, Dr. Gray's pamphlet on "Why We Believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ," is most timely. He not only quotes what Matthew and Luke tell explicitly about our Lord's conception by the Holy Ghost, but he cites other Biblical passages that either imply it or teach it directly. He shows that Celsus and Porphyry, of the second and third centuries, attacked this doctrine. The attempt to class Christ's virgin birth with the pagan myths is shown to be futile as well as irreverent. The sinlessness of Christ postulates the virgin birth. A real divine incarnation would be impossible otherwise. It is a strong presentation. Price, 7 cents each; 75 cents per dozen; \$5.50 per hundred.

Every lover of truth will thank Fleming H. Revell Company, New York and Chicago, for bringing out in attractive paper-bound form William Jennings Bryan's "Orthodox Christianity versus Modernism." In this brochure the noted author defends Fundamentalism as it is known in his own denomination, the Presbyterian Church. He makes a strong case. In his own way he establishes the same conclusion at which Dr. J. G. Machen arrives in his notable book, "Christianity and Liberalism," namely, that there can be no truce between the two viewpoints. Modernism is not true Christianity, but merely a subjective, and therefore a wrong interpretation of it. In two chapters Mr. Bryan discusses the issue with telling force: "The Fundamentals" and "Science versus Evolution." Because Mr. Bryan has a simple and popular style, it must not be thought that he is superficial; he simply is clear, while his purpose is to be understood by everybody rather than to astound people with technical learning and cloud the issue with erudite terms. In this pamphlet he proves himself the friend of science, and is skillful in showing that science and evolution are not one and the same. For that very reason, too, evolution is contrary to the teaching of Christianity. Price, 35 cents.

If the report of the committee of the New York Presbytery, which exonerated Dr. Fosdick, could be brought before the bar of reason pure and simple, they would have no case in any ecclesiastical court. In a pamphlet of rare power by the Rev. Charles Hilman Fountain, with the title, "The Case Against Dr.

Fosdick," this committee is tried at the bar of reason. He takes up their statements one by one, puts them into the crucible of analysis, and shows how far from the Biblical teaching and the Presbyterian standards they are. Just how the committee or Dr. Fosdick will help themselves out of their logical dilemma, it is difficult to see. The trouble with such men is they do not reason clearly. They have a case to prove, and facts and logic must bend accordingly. Mr. Fountain has a right to make his protest, because he is a Baptist, and therefore belongs to the same denomination as Dr. Fosdick. He says that the Baptist Church has a direct interest in the case, because Dr. Fosdick and his confreres have stirred up the same controversy among the Baptists that they have among the Presbyterians. It will pay any one to get the booklet. Send five cents to the author, Plainfield, New Jersey.

A correspondent writes that there is a lack of definiteness about the charges of modernism among the missionaries of China; he wants specifications. He will find what he wants in a brochure issued by Rev. Hugh W. White, D.D.; from whose personal letter we quoted in a previous number of this journal. The title of the pamphlet is, "We Must Separate to Save Our Faith." Dr. White is the author of that eye-opening book, "Demonism Verified and Analyzed." In his booklet just issued he shows by direct quotations and citations of books like those of Fosdick and Gerald B. Smith how sadly modernism has entrenched itself among the teachers of some of the missions. There are two bad features about the situation in China. The first is that the modernist propaganda is there and is doing its deadly work; the second is that the modernists are trying to make people believe that there is no such propaganda going on. Thus they deceive many people, who do not want to believe that there is anything wrong. Let people get Dr. White's booklet, and see that the situation in China is really serious and that specifications are given in a convincing way. Until April first address Dr. H. W. White, Yencheng, Kiangsu, China; after which, care of Rev. W. M. White, D.D., Raleigh, N. C.

Get the following booklet at once: "Faith's Foundations," published by Marshall Brothers, 24-25 Paternoster Row, London, England. It contains a brief report of the great demonstration in support of the full inspiration of the Bible held last December in the Royal Albert Hall, London, said to be the

greatest meeting of the kind ever held in that city; then it gives the addresses delivered at that time; and they are very much to the point. "A Fraternal Union" has been formed, consisting of men and women who believe in the plenary inspiration of the Bible and all its great doctrines. Already at the time of the printing of this book over 3,000 members had enrolled. And yet Dr. Foakes Jackson declared a few months ago that such an uprising as that of the evangelical movement in this country would be impossible in Great Britain, because there the modernists had already won the day. That proves just how dull is the vision of a liberalist when he tries to read the signs of the times. The booklet is one shilling in England. Order it through your book-dealer, who will know its price in American money. Should you wish to join the above-named "Fraternal Union," write for particulars to Rev. E. A. Carter, Room C, 43 Newington Butts, London, S. E. 11, England. The addresses delivered on this momentous occasion were by Bishop Ingham, Sir William Ramsay, Rev. H. D. Chilvers (very acute), Dr. Dinsdale T. Young, with a letter from Dr. A. H. Sayce.

If you wish to read a keenly written booklet, send ten cents to "The Presbyterian," 1217 Market street, Philadelphia, Pa., and get Dr. Oswald T. Allis's "Jericho Prophets." Dr. Allis calls those prophets the "theological liberals in the days of Elijah," and compares them with the liberalistic school of today. There are many resemblances between the old and the modern, as the author clearly shows. It is interesting to trace them. It is just possible that the liberalistic critics of God's Word have been "evolved" from the Jericho prophets of the olden days! "To discredit the Old Testament is to dishonor Christ," rightly says Dr. Allis.

If you enjoy both argument and fun, send for "Gabe's Trial," by James Wood Bouldin, Concord Depot, Va. No price is given; so send a card of inquiry to the author. Uncle Gabe, a colored minister, was forced to resign his pastorate for preaching evolution. The account of the trial is given here, with Uncle Gabe's arguments set forth in his own peculiar and laughable *patois*. Here is a sample of his speech: "But I haint no hairy-tick, if I does b'lieve in ever-lootin'." Can you translate it?

Our Library Exchange Department

Advertising in this department is exclusively for Bible Champion Subscribers. Only articles used in a Library—Books, Typewriters, etc.—may be offered. Cash must accompany order at following rates: 10c a line for first insertion, and 8c a line for every insertion after first. Count 7 words to a line. Minimum charge 30c per insertion. Remit to Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NOTE—Where only initials are given in address make money order payable to Bible Champion or order and payment will be forwarded to proper party.

FOR SALE—Complete set Homiletical Commentary on the Old Testament, 21 volumes, good as new condition. Cost \$60.00—will sell for \$20 cash. Address Homiletical, care Bible Champion Reading, Pa.

SALE—World's Parliament of Religions, new, 2 vols., morocco, \$3.00. Address J. K. L., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS—Universal Encyclopedia, 6 vols., cloth, cost \$15—for \$7.50; 6,000 Years of Church History, 10 vols., cloth, cost \$15.00—for \$7.50; Compendium Evangelical Theology, *Passmore*, cost \$3.00—for \$1.25; American Bookman, *Howe*, cost \$2.50—for \$1.25; Professing Christians, *Finney*, cost \$1.75—for \$1.00. All new from an unused library and tops show a bit of shelf exposure. Sent prepaid. Address, S. S. T., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FREE! Every pastor should know the vast growth of both kinds of Mormonism and how to meet conditions. Working outside of Utah they have 2,000 emissaries, and have 1,200 organizations. Get a Free Sample copy of *Light on Mormonism*, edited by Rev. J. D. Nutting, for 31 years missionary among Mormons. Subscription price is 25c a year, 10 or more copies at Club rate—14c per year. Post the town! Utah Gospel Mission, 9277 Amesbury Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. 4-2

FOR SALE—Letter Copying Press, perfect condition, like new, cost \$8.00, for \$2.50. Address, H. I. J., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Volume "The Resurrection," by West. Address, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS—These books all cost \$1.50 each. Will sell any one for 75c, prepaid. Scientific Faith, *Johnston*; Paradoxical Pain, *Harbin*; Progress of Religious Freedom, *Schlaff*; The Higher Critic's Bible or God's Bible, *Burns*; Steps Unto Heaven, *Carpenter*; Gift of Mind to Spirit, *Kulaner*; Divine Movement in Israel, *Porter*; The Life that Really Is, *Abbott*. Address, N. O. P., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

BIBLE COMMENTARY—Just like new. Lange's on Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, James, Revelation. Will sell for \$1.50 any single vol., or \$10 for the 8 vols. Prepaid east of Rockies. Address P. R. S., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—Lange's Commentary on Job, cloth, *Schaff*, cost \$3.00—for \$1.75; Greater Life Work of Christ, *Patterson*, cost \$1.50—75c; Old Testament Introduction, *Raven*, cost \$2.00, net—for \$1.25; Preacher Problems, *Moore*, cost \$1.50, net—for 90c; Getting One's Bearings, *McKenzie*, cost \$1.25, net—for 75c; The Fascination of the Book, cost \$1.25, net—for 75c; Unselfishness of God, *Smith*, cost \$1.25, net—for 75c. All sent prepaid. These are bargains. Address, A. A. B., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Vols. 1, 2, 3 Bible Student and Teacher—either bound or unbound. Name price and give condition. Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

WANTED—Copy of Dr. Gregory's "Why Four Gospels." Give conditions and price. Address Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—NEW. Christianity's Greatest Peril, *Ekhholm*, (\$1.50) for 90c; Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, *Thorburn*, (\$2.00) for \$1.25; Christ, His Nature and Work, (\$1.75) for \$1.10; Up in Maine, 6th Ed., *Day*, (\$1.00) for 50c; Chat About Celebrities, *Guild*, (\$1.50) for 85c; Way of the Preacher, *Kern*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Revivals, How and When, *Newell*, (\$1.25) for 65c. Address, S. T. U., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—Books like New. Figures in parenthesis show what they cost. Will mail any book prepaid for 50c. Romance of Providence, (\$1.50); Landmarks of the Evangelical Association, (\$1.50); S. S. Movement in America, (\$1.25); Science and Religion, (\$1.00); Nature and Culture, (\$1.00); How to Gesture, (\$1.00); Modern Cities, (\$1.00); Fifth Years, (\$1.00); Henry Boynton Smith, (\$1.00); Protestant Church in France, (\$1.25). Address, A. B. B., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

CHEAP NEW BOOKS—Artists and Arabs, cost 75c—for 40c; A Study in Pedagogy, cost 75c—for 40c; S. S. Normal Class, cost 50c—for 25c; Yet Speaking, cost 50c—for 30c; Life's Every-dayness, cost 50c—for 30c; Good Tidings, cost 35c—for 20c; Environment, cost 25c—for 15c. Address, A. B. B., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—Fundamentals and their Contrast, *Buckley*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Chosen of God, *Lathe*, (\$1.25) for 65c; Municipal Reform Movement, *Tolman*, (\$1.00) for 40c; Methods & Principles, *Winship*, (\$1.00) for 60c; The Growth of the Kingdom, *Gulick*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Return of the Lord Jesus, *Torrey*, (\$1.00) for 75c. All postpaid at price named. Address, M. N. O., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

SECOND-HAND BOOKS CHEAP—Prices in parenthesis are what books cost new. The Broken Seal, *Green*, (\$1.50) for 35c; Hamilton's Mexican Hand Book, *Ills.*, (\$1.50) for 35c; Relations of the Republic and Laws of Religious Corporations, *Kynett*, (\$2.50) for 50c; Christ for India, *Lucas*, (\$2.00) for 50c; Dewey's Works, (\$2.50) for 75c. All fully worth price asked. All sent prepaid. Address, O. P. R., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

LIKE NEW BOOKS—Pronouncing Bible, sheep binding, with Books of Psalms in meter, \$1.25; N. T. Annotated Paragraph Bible, 8 vo., \$1.00; Platform Echoes, *Gough*, 8 vo., \$1.00; The Old Way, *Rhoads* 50c. All like new, all prepaid. Address S. L. D., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NEW BOOKS CHEAP—All Matters Tend to Rotatio, *Hamilton*, (\$2.00) for \$1.25; Doubters and their Doubts, *Darling*, (\$1.00) for 50c; Sanctified Spice, *Peters*, (\$75) for 40c; Pleasures of Literature and Solace of Books, *Shaylor* (\$75) for 50c; The Listener in the Church, (35c) for 25c; *Wasson's Religious, Social & Political Essays*, (\$1.50) for 75c; Great Books as Life Teachers, *Hillis*, (\$1.50) for 75c; All prepaid. Address R. S. T., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

OUR BOOK BARGAIN COUNTER

Good Books at half price. All bound in Cloth. All perfectly new.

CHRISTIANITY AND POSITIVISM

By JAS. McCOSH, D.D., LL.D., Pres. Princeton College.
12 mo., 370 pp., \$1.75

Special Price, 75 cents, prepaid

"The thinking is generally so clear, and the style so animated and luminous, that any person of average intelligence and culture may understand and enjoy the discussion; and no such person who has begun to read the work will be likely to rest satisfied till he has finished it. This book grapples directly with the vital questions. Every reader must admire its fairness."—*N. Y. Independent*.

PIVOT WORDS OF SCRIPTURE

By REV. PHILIP B. POWER, M.A. 353 pp., \$1.50
Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

A pivot being a small point on which something else turns, the title of this volume seems to be very descriptive of those little words of Holy Scripture upon which turns the actual interpretation of a passage, and to which we are indebted for some of the most powerful teachings of God's word, whether they relate to His mercy or His wrath, as in cases of "for," "through," "yet," "then," "but," "and." "It is pointed, crisp, fresh, and dealing with live issues."—*Christian World*.

CHRIST AND HIS RELIGION

By REV. JOHN REID, 12 mo., 311 pp., \$1.50
Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

Not an ingathering of threadbare suggestions, but a mine of fresh nuggets within the reach of all. There is a combination of depth of thought and simplicity of expression.

"Keen and clear conception of truth mark this volume. The author is a man of thought, and his calm and well-balanced views give a charm to his writing. There is a strength of truth in every page."—*Christian Union*.

VOICES OF THE SOUL ANSWERED IN GOD

By REV. JOHN REID, 374 pp., 4th Edition, \$1.50
Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

The soul needs a way to reach God, a way to become holy, a way to become happy. Hence the book is divided into three parts; it shows how the wants of the mind can be met in a Redeemer, Restorer, and Satisfier. Meditation must come first, then restoration, then satisfaction.

"That the soul of man can find its hopes realized, its wants satisfied, its fears quieted and its measures filled in God alone, is the leading thought of this calm and powerful book. The presentation is most serious, original and suggestive."—*N. Y. Observer*.

ART AND MORALITY

By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D.
Price, 25 cents, prepaid

A frank treatise by this popular author on Art as that portion of man's work which is inspired by the love of beauty. Not all the beautiful actions of men can be called artistic, but the author insists that the artist who deals with human life shall not divest himself of his humanity; and that he shall not conceal his sympathy with goodness and purity and honor.

"Sterling in sense."—*West. Christian Advocate*.

"A thoroughly instructive and readable volume."—*United Presbyterian*.

CONCESSIONS OF LIBERALISTS TO

ORTHODOXY

By DAN'L DOCHESTER, D.D. 344 pp., \$1.50

Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

This work was originally prepared as a course of lectures, and was delivered before the School of Theology of Boston University. It is worthy of all commendation for the extensive research shown by the author, and the presentation of the three cardinal topics: The Deity of Christ, the Atonement, and Endless Punishment.

"A rich army for offensive and defensive warfare against theological error."—*Religious Herald*.

"The doctor's style is singularly pure and candid, and the diction and dignity, scholarship and research is manifest in every page."—*West. Christ. Advocate*.

FEATHERS FOR SHAFTS

OR READINGS IN THE BOOK. By J. BERG ESEN-WEIN, PH. D., LITT. D. Beautiful cloth, with gold design on side. 50 cents.

Special Price, 35 cents, prepaid

Choice Bible Reading by the author, assisted by leading American Bible Students: James H. Brookes, D.D., W. J. Erdman, D.D., Albert Erdman, D.D., Pastor D. M. Stearns, D. L. Moody, J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D., C. H. Yatman and many others.

"The Bible Readings are diversified and comprehend most of the principal subjects claiming the attention of Christian people."—*Christian World*.

"Especially useful to persons who wish to conduct public Bible Readings or studies in the word of God in the social meeting. Get it."—*Conference Herald*.

"I WILLS" OF THE PSALMS

By REV. PHILIP B. BOWER, M. A. 404 pp., \$1.25
Special Price, 65 cents, prepaid

This devotional volume inspires Faith and Trust in time of need; is filled with forceful illustrations; is destined rather to suggest than to teach, though it does both. It is an elaborate treatment of the "I Will" of Trust, "I Will" of Power, "I Will" of Action, and the "I Will" of Praise. Written in very attractive manner, sympathetic and solicitous, by one devoted to the office of ministering to the saints. A book for the library, the home, the study table, being the determination of the man of God, as found in some of the "I Wills" of the Psalms.

"It is a real mine of suggestiveness."—*Churchman*.

THE HUMAN FLOWER

A simple statement of the Relation of Sexes.
By ELLIS ETHELMER

Cloth, 12 mo., 50 cents, prepaid

Julia McNair Wright, the well-known authoress, says: "The book, in chaste, elegant, clear, simple, thorough fashion, treats of animal, especially human, generation and birth, giving the subject the same clear, pure dignified treatment hitherto reserved for that other half of biological study, the study of plant life. This book teaches the parents much that parents do not know and have to teach the child. It is a book to be in every home, and in plain sight."

"A delicate subject is dealt with in a plain, straight-forward way, but without the slightest coarseness."—*Glascow Herald*.

"Pure, strong, and true, a book to be welcomed by parents."—*N. Y. Christian Advocate*.

Address FRANK J. BOYER, Reading, Pa.

SPECIAL

Hose for Summer Wear

We want you to try our No. 77 Socks for Men, and our No. 25 Hose for Ladies—Our Two Specials for Summer Wear.

Our No. 77 Sock for Men is a semi-full fashioned, Tram Silk and Art mixed, extra fine gauge, double sole and heel. Looks like fine silk but will out-wear several pair silk socks. We know of no hose to equal it for appearance and wear at the price. Sizes from 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 11 $\frac{1}{2}$.

Our No. 25 Hose for Ladies is made of same material as our No. 77. Has drop stitch for low shoes, strong garter top, double sole and heel, is semi-full fashion, with seam back. Sizes 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 10.

Price of these two Hose is same. They are not sold for less than 3 pairs for \$1.65 or \$6.25 per dozen.

But to introduce them to you we offer you one pair of No. 77 and one pair No. 25, the two pairs for \$1.00. Or will mail you two pairs of either No. 77 or No. 25 for \$1.00. Always prepaid.

Your money back if you are not pleased—you run No Risk!

BOYER MANUFACTURING CO., READING, PA.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly. \$3 a year

MELVIN GROVE KYLE

Moses and the Monuments: Light from Archaeology on Pentateuchal Times.

Stone Lectures, 1919. 300 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid. (In press)

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism. 325 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$1.65, postpaid.

The Problem of the Pentateuch. 300 pp. 8vo, cloth, \$2.15, postpaid.

HAROLD M. WIENER

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. 255 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$1.50, postpaid.

The Coup de Grace to the Wellhausen Critics.

The Origin of the Pentateuch. 150 pages, 8vo, 40 cents, postpaid.

A Comprehensive Answer to the Wellhausen Critics.

Pentateuchal Studies. 350 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

The Wellhausen Critics in extremis.

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

The Ice Age in North America, and Its Bearings Upon the Antiquity of Man. 6th Edition. 210 illustrations. 808 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$6.00, postpaid.

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History. 3d Edition. 40 illustrations. 450 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

Origin and Antiquity of Man. Many illustrations. 550 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

Story of My Life and Work. 476 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA CO., 6834 Washington Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

A Real High Class

Phonograph

at Wholesale

Solid Mahogany Wood—not veneer. Unequalled for beauty of Design. Every separate part of this phonograph represents well-nigh perfection in workmanship, material, and design.

The superior construction of the Table; the Motor, each part of which is made of the finest gauge limits and assembled to run with the precision of a watch—silent and true; the scientific construction of the Tone Chamber for proper diffusion of sound waves, and complying with the proved laws of acoustics; the Tone Arm; the Producer; all acclaim the obvious superiority of this Phonograph.

It plays **any record** made without any extra attachments by an easy turn of the Tone Arm.

Made in the graceful and artistic charm of table construction in the original period of the furniture age.

The Phonograph is concealed in the Drawer. Remove the crank and there is absolutely no evidence of a phonograph about the table.

Chippendale Design

Solid Mahogany, gold plate trimmings.

Retail price \$550.00. Table dimensions 28x48.



Our price directly to you--\$240.00

The Bible Champion stands ready to guarantee every claim made for the phonograph. Write for catalogue.

BOYER MANUFACTURING CO., READING, PA.